

Andrew Stahl: Hi, this is Andrew Stahl. Good morning to Allison, David, Gina, Marco, and whoever else is listening in today. I want to clarify that FC's objection, is that this permit process in regard to the Forest Service was not sent back to the applicant or to FERC at the first date. That is when the Forest Service evaluates whether a permit applicant's activities, accord with Forest Plan Standards.

Andrew Stahl: Obviously you've come up with 15 or so standards that need to be changed on environmental grounds. The standard that applies throughout the National Forest that bars special use permits for activities that can be accommodated on private land is one that you acknowledge in the EIS. Fail entirely to have dealt with and should have been the grounds for telling FERC, BLM, and the permit applicant, that they can pursue their pipeline on non-National Forest Lands. I'm actually sorry that the Forest Service is even here. You shouldn't be to begin with. You shouldn't have been to begin with. This should have been treated like any other permit applicant who tries to conduct an activity on National Forest Lands that could've been carried out on private lands instead. The Forest Service simply isn't in the business of managing the National Forest to accommodate each and every person's favorite thing to do. You shouldn't be competing with private property owners and you should be managing the National Forest for the primary purposes for which they were reserved.

Andrew Stahl: Now I assume that you are familiar with the Cow Pasture River Preservation Association case in the fourth circuit in 2018. That decision is dispositive here and pretty much should end this case right now.

Andrew Stahl: The situations identical to that here. Where a natural gas pipeline applicant sought a permit to cross National Forest Lands and the court said "no, you could run this pipeline on private lands and the Forest Service failed to ever consider that alternative thus violating both the NFMA substantively and NEPA procedurally." The same identical facts situation applies here.

Andrew Stahl: I want to ask Alice and the others on the line, whether you've had a chance to review exhibit B to our objection. Which provides a map and shows that it's a trivial matter to run a pipeline between Malin and Coos Bay without ever crossing National Forest Lands. Have you folks had a chance to see that map?

Allison: Yes, Andy, we have had a chance to see that map, which is I believe your route that is a proposed route that would go on non-Forest Service Lands. Is that correct?

Andrew Stahl: That's correct. Now the EIS,

Allison: Thank you.

Andrew Stahl: said it's not possible to draw such a map, but we did. So I have a question for you. Do you see anything infeasible or factually incorrect about the

cryptography of that map? Did we make a mistake in delineating the boundaries of the National Forest for example?

Allison: That I will have to take a more in depth look once we have listened to all today, Andy. Then do an in depth review of that and then understand [crosstalk 00:04:33] .

Andrew Stahl: I know that you guys know. [crosstalk 00:04:37].

Debbie Anderson...: So Andy.

Andrew Stahl: That's great Alison. I know you guys know where your own boundaries are. The GIS data that we used [crosstalk 00:04:46] to develop this map is yours actually

Debbie Anderson...: Yes, and we're comparing[crosstalk 00:04:52].

Andrew Stahl: Go ahead Debbie.

Debbie Anderson...: We're comparing that route that you submitted with our GIS data as you know. We're also making sure that we had access to that route previously.

Andrew Stahl: In what sense? I understood the first part of that, which is that you'll look at your own boundaries. I didn't understand the second part of that comment that you had access to that route previously. What do you mean by that?

Debbie Anderson...: So if it was previously proposed by your group, then that's something that we would have a record of. We're searching to ensure that we had that record.

Andrew Stahl: This particular route was put forward to you in response to your comments on our draft EIS comments. So you won't find this particular route in the record before the subsection process. So don't bother looking. What you will find is our timely comments on the draft EIS saying that this kind of route is feasible. There's no ownership based, map-based reason why you couldn't run this pipeline between these two points without crossing National Forest Lands. We made that argument and pointed out that those facts in our comments on the draft EIS. We made the objection and I must admit the government's response to our comments was somewhat inexplicable. The Forest Service confused the notion of a route that doesn't cross National Forest Land, which is, we've shown is quite feasible. Versus a route that doesn't cross any federal land. BLM, National Park Service, what have you. Far as we could tell that was simply a straw man. We agree that it does not appear feasible to get from Malin to Coos Bay without crossing some sort of federal lands. So we never did understand why the Forest Service in its response to our draft GIS comment, said that there was no choice but to cross National Forest Land, because there was no way of not crossing federal land. Could you explain how it is that the government got confused about the distinction between National Forest Land and other federal lands?

Debbie Anderson...: So,

Andrew Stahl: Anybody [crosstalk 00:08:06].

Debbie Anderson...: So, this is Debbie again. Sorry, we're making sure that we're thoughtful here. So at this time I don't think that we're prepared to answer that exact question. That will be one of the responses that we're looking for in the objection review. Is to ensure that we tracked your comments and did respond to them. That is part of what we are doing.

Andrew Stahl: Okay.

David: One more thing, Andy, this is Dave again. I will elaborate a little bit on that. That with first record, it is very voluminous behind the EIF. They were in charge of the body of the EIF and the material that was in there. Lumping versus splitting is an art not a science and while we're a cooperator, we weren't allowed to direct that process as cleanly as we hoped. However, with the objection process we should be able to provide you more specificity on the considerations of non-Forest Service routes. So bear with us as we work through this objection resolution process and we will provide some more details. I can assure you that.

Andrew Stahl: Okay. If you during the course of your objection review need the computer files, the data files, on which Dr. Chen prepared this map. Feel free to request those of us and we'd be happy to provide the underlying data. They're all, her analysis is based all on publicly accessible. In fact most of it, a lot of it's your data. GIS layers access through the standard commercial vendors who deal in this stuff. There's nothing that we regard as proprietary to us in this data and we'd be happy to make available those GIS layers and the analysis files that went into building that map.

Andrew Stahl: [crosstalk 00:10:35] [inaudible 00:10:35] Yeah.

Allison: Did you hear me, I'm sorry, my voice.

Andrew Stahl: Yes, yes I did hear you. I wanted to close unless you have further questions just by saying that, while you could go through, a revise EIS process that does consider a non-National Forest Land route. It seems to me that would be a silly thing to do. It would essentially create a precedent for any special use permit applicant who seeks to use National Forest Land for an activity that they could have done on private land. To compel the government to go through a NEPA process that looks at accommodating that use on National Forest Land and looks at accommodating that use on private land. Comes to the conclusion that the Forest Service could have made right from the outset and that its own special use permitting regulations require be made at first contact by the applicant. Which is to say, "No, you can do that on private lands." We don't need to do a whole NEPA process to be able to tell that you could build that golf course on private land or you could route that pipeline on private land.

Andrew Stahl: I don't think the Forest Service would be well served by supplementing it's EIS. Instead the Forest Service should simply say, "oops, we shouldn't have been a part of this permit process at all. Our forest plans, bar activities on National Forest that could be accommodated on private land. It's obvious just based on a look at the land ownership maps that you could have done that. You're going to have to make it at a minimum, a better case to us that you couldn't do that." Which Pacific Connector never has made that case. "Before we'll even be willing to sit at the table." You could say the same thing to FERC as well. I'm sure that they would understand that the Forest Plan Standards are mandatory required by the NFMA and particularly since they were recently reminded of that fact in the Cow Pasture River Preservation Association case. With that I don't have anything further to add and if you have any clarifying questions for me, now's the time to ask them.

Debbie Anderson...: Thank you Andy. I will pause here and look to Alice and Michael to see if they have any additional questions at this time and if Gina is listening, she can email me her questions. So I'm looking at Michael. Oh, excuse me.

Michael: I don't have any questions for you, but I do thank you for, for your comments and the work that you've put into this. Thank you very much.

Andrew Stahl: Our Pleasure

Debbie Anderson...: Alice,

Alice: Thanks Andy.

Debbie Anderson...: Okay. Andy, you were at 14 minutes and 12 seconds. Well done.

Andrew Stahl: Okay. I hope I set the standard for the rest of your day and I'll see you again in the afternoon and maybe that will be even faster, I think so.

Debbie Anderson...: Okay. We'll speak again this afternoon. Thank you so much. Okay.

Andrew Stahl: Okay. Bye bye.

Debbie Anderson...: One thing I did not. Thank you. One thing I did not mention is that if there is time for a break at some point we will take that. If we're ahead of schedule, just to be polite to everybody on the line as well as in this conference room. Right now I think we're doing okay. We will move on.

Debbie Anderson...: Macy, if you can unmute the next caller. We actually have three objectors that will speak over the next 45 minutes. They were all co-signers to Western Environmental Law Centers. I did not break them out individually. So at this point if you could unmute the lines between Susan Jane Brown, Doug Heikin and Francis Etherington, that would be helpful. They all signed the same objection, they get to decide how they want to share that 45 minutes.

Macy: Caller go ahead.

Susan Jane Brow...: Great. So this is Susan Jane Brown. I think we've got Doug Heikin and Francis Etherington on the line as well. We didn't really coordinate how we're going to handle this, but I do have a series of questions that perhaps we can start with that and then Doug and Francis can chime in as appropriate if that works for folks.

Doug Heiken; Or...: Sounds good.

Debbie Anderson...: Sounds good.

Susan Jane Brow...: Good.

Francis Etherin...: That works for me as well.

Susan Jane Brow...: Okay. I have a couple logistical questions and, of course this is pretty awkward being on the phone. Not only am I not in the room with my fellow objectors, but I'm also not in the room with the Forest Service or interested parties. So I appreciate everybody's grace and trying to deal with a pretty difficult logistical situation. In terms of logistical questions. I am curious if the Forest Service can confirm if representatives from Pembina are on the phone with us today. Whether or not they will be given a time to either speak or respond to what they've heard on the line from objectors.

Debbie Anderson...: So this is Debbie Anderson, Pembina registered as an interested person. Ryan Childs is their representative. He is registered for the call. I do not know if he is dialed in at this time. He did not request time to speak. So I will ask Macy to open Ryan's line to confirm if he is here or not.

Macy: Ryan you can go ahead.

Ryan Childs; Pa...: Yes, this is Ryan Childs with Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline. I'm a representative. Just to confirm, I am listening in and I do not plan to speak today. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson...: Thank you Ryan.

Susan Jane Brow...: Great. Yep. Thanks for that confirmation. I just wanted to know who all was on the phone with the rest of us. As the Forest Service moved forward with responding to objections. This is a question for the Forest Service. Will the project applicant or the Forest Service be drafting the responses to the objections? Can you clarify who will be in charge of that?

Debbie Anderson...: Only the Forest Service will be drafting responses to the objections. That is, it's a Forest Service responsibility and the Forest Service's role. This is Debbie.

Susan Jane Brow...: Okay. Since that is the Forest Service's legal obligation and I would agree that it should be something that you guys do. Is it possible that in response to objections, which as you mentioned are, are numerous and touch on a number of issues. Is it a possible outcome that the Forest Service either decides to deny the permit application or at the very least decides that supplementation of the existing EIS is required or is that not an option that's on the table?

Debbie Anderson...: David can speak to the permit part. I cannot.

David: Yeah, I think there's a misunderstanding with most folks. We do not have a permit. This is delegated authority under the Mineral Leasing Act to the Department of Interior and their agents is the Bureau of Land Management that has an application pending. We work under the concurrent process, that's described in the Mineral Leasing Act, section 28.

Debbie Anderson...: So that's the part on the permit as far as possible outcomes. I was planning on going over that at the end of the call, but I can give you a quick overview. Our written response can be either to proceed as planned with no changes. To proceed with clarification, if we find there is need to clarify something in the draft decision. We can direct Alice to stop and assess what she does to do next. We don't necessarily direct her to do a supplement. That's within her decision space. If we found information that needed to be addressed. She could choose to do additional analysis and then go through the objections process again or she could choose to do a supplement and then she would have to go through the comment and objection process again. The reviewing officer's scope and scale is to review the objections and respond to them. It's not like the old appeals process where we have a remand for example.

Debbie Anderson...: It's more of a here's what you need to address and then we leave that to the responsible official to decide how then to do that. Did that answer your question Susan Jane?

Susan Jane Brow...: Yeah, I think so. I guess part of the reason behind my question, and this sort of echoes what Andy Stahl was also alluding to. I don't think any of us really think the Forest Service wants to be in this position. I'm sympathetic to that. We don't think you should be here either. We don't think this project should be here. I'm curious how baked this decision is. Is this just a pro forma meeting or is it possible that based on objections, which again are numerous and quite specific, in a lot of cases and raise a number of legal issues. If the Forest Service isn't going to make any additional changes to what we've already seen in the SEIS and in the draft ROD. I'd like to know that.

Debbie Anderson...: David tried to explain where the Forest Service's decision base is. So again, it's not the Forest Service's EIS. We're basing our decision on that EIS. So our ability to influence change on that EIS is rather limited to just the Forest Service's scope of action. I just need to make that clear, because it is not the Forest Service's EIS. We do have, [crosstalk 00:21:23].

Susan Jane Brow...: We are aware of that. That's pretty clear.

Debbie Anderson...: Yes. So Allison.

Allison: I would say Susan, that I bear this responsibility in all earnestness of everything that I do and I've done for many years with the Forest Service. This is a project we all know that's proposed, that's larger than the Forest Service. So I have a lot of other colleagues that have varying authorities in this project. FERC has the primary authority and responsibility. Obviously, Army Corps has some. The BLM has the permitting authority for the National Forest System Lands. So that said, I guess what I would say is that I am committed to doing the best job that we can. Given the authorities and responsibilities that are laid with us. I just want to really clarify with you that I'm listening quite carefully. I want to make sure that we're doing a best job. I want to make sure that we've considered everything that you all are saying with an open ear and an open heart. Right. So we will take what you're saying today. I understand this is kind of a more awkward forum than we're normally able to join in on. I really appreciate you doing this. Please know that's my full intention.

Susan Jane Brow...: Great. I appreciate that. Okay. So those were sort of my logistical questions. Then I have a couple of substantive ones that are related to our objection. Debbie, when you first were speaking, you mentioned the crosswalk that basically attempts to match up the proposed amendments with the substantive provisions of the 2012 planning rule and then the replacement forest plan components that would be utilized in replacement of the existing standards and guidelines in the existing forest plans. You responded to me over email, that that crosswalk is located in appendix F-2 which is true. I found that there. So thanks for pointing that out. As you all are aware, appendix F actually has 11 parts so it's an extremely large document. In fact, it's pretty close to the size of the underlying EIS. F-2, and this is what all of the proposed amendments say, is that the proposed amendments basically nod to the languages applicable mitigation measures identified in the POD and Pacific Connector Project Design requirements.

Susan Jane Brow...: The PODs themselves are also several volumes and very, very lengthy and contain a whole bunch of language, whole bunch of words. My question for the Forest Service is which applicable mitigation measures are we talking about? Which POD are we talking about? Because as you are aware, the 2012 planning rule as amended by the 2016 amendment to the rule, requires much more than just an oblique reference to applicable mitigation measures in a POD. That is, first of all, it's not clear which POD you're talking about cause there are several PODs. What underlying plan components are in those PODs that are replacing the plan components that you're amending. Can you point me to those? To the specific PODs and those specific replacement plan components?

David: It's going to be difficult to do that right now in this process. I think we could do that in a reply back to you in the objection process. I think that's the appropriate venue for us to do that. Instead of trying to walk us through in this meeting,

cause we're really looking at resolution points today. Only thing I can say is we tried to provide detail and pointing to the specific sections of a plan of development specific to the resource being impacted. So if it's water quality, we provided a specific reference to the POD section that would have the applicable project design features or mitigation specific to that resource. Same thing with visuals. Same thing with upland impacts and restoration. So if you look at the references provided per plan amendment, that should get you to the sections in those PODs. What I'm hearing is you're not seeing that clearly enough. So that seems like a good opportunity for us to clarify perhaps, or it's up to Alice and the reviewing official to give me direction on what they want in the way of a clarifying document.

Susan Jane Brow...: Yeah. I mean, my opinion is that the amendments are inadequate under NSMA given the way that they are structured and the references. So for example, I'm looking at Forest Plan Amendments. This does get into a site specific Forest Plan Amendments as opposed to a plan level. They are all interrelated of course. For example, looking at the Forest Plan Amendments related to rare aquatic ancestral, plant and animal communities. So this is survey and manage standard that you're eliminating. The appendix F-2 references, things like POD I, POD U, POD P, but I don't see the specifics. I definitely think you frankly need to revise the proposed amendment.

Susan Jane Brow...: As written, the proposed amendment refers to unnamed and unidentified PODs and mitigation measures. I think under the Cow Pasture and the Sierra Club cases that Andrew was referencing, and that we discuss in our objection. Under that case law, I think your amendments are inadequate. I assume we disagree on that but that is definitely something that I would highly recommend that you take a really close look at. The public has no idea what mitigation measures are. In fact replacing well known standards and guidelines like survey and manage just as an example. So I definitely hope to see that in the objection response and hopefully doesn't just reiterate the reference to very voluminous PODs and amorphous mitigation measures.

Allison: Thanks for clarifying that for us Susan Jane. I think I feel now as though I understand the heart of your concern about this. So that's been helpful to me.

Susan Jane Brow...: Great. Then my last question before I turn it over to Doug and Francis. One of the objection points that we raised is that we believe additional amendments are necessary. Either site-specific Forest Plan Amendments or Forest Wide Amendments. I would like to hear from the Forest Service what your response is to that concern?

Debbie Anderson...: Susan Jane, this is Debbie Anderson again. That is something we are still working on. We have not finished the entire review. So we are going through each of those very carefully and trying to address them. We have not finished that review at this time.

Susan Jane Brow...: Okay. [crosstalk 00:29:46] Do you have that.

Debbie Anderson....: Bottom line, I can't answer that right now?

Susan Jane Brow....: Yeah, I figured I would also guess that at the end of this call you'll tell us something about timing.

Debbie Anderson....: Yes.

Susan Jane Brow....: I know that both sets of objections have time limits for the agency to respond. Presumably you'll meet those timelines and that's when we can expect a final response to objections and a final ROD

Debbie Anderson....: Yes. Well the final response to the objections. The timing of the ROD is an entirely different process. Would you like me to just address that quickly now instead of through voicemail,

Doug Heiken; Or....: Sure.

Debbie Anderson....: because I know some people probably don't want to stay on the call the entire three hours.

Susan Jane Brow....: Yeah, that'd be perfect.

Debbie Anderson....: Okay. As you know we have two different processes that I tried to introduce at the beginning. The Forest Plan Amendments that are the permanent amendment, which is the matrix to the LSR. That objection filing period closed on January 22nd, 2020. The response to the reviewing or the response to the responsible official. So Gina's response to Alice is due April 21st.

Debbie Anderson....: Under the 219 objection regulations, that response deadline can be extended indefinitely. With by, indefinitely,

Susan Jane Brow....: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Debbie Anderson....: There's no hard deadline.

Susan Jane Brow....: Okay.

Debbie Anderson....: Under the 218 objection regulations, the filing period closed January 7th. There's a 45 day review period. Which we have already passed or are passing as we speak. I'm trying to look at my, yeah, we've already passed. Then there's the additional 30 day extension. That is due March 23rd. As with all objection reviews, it is our intention to meet that deadline.

Debbie Anderson....: For the 218 plan amendment objection issues. We will meet that much 23rd deadline. Given there is one 219 objection issue. My intention, given the workload though, my intention is to combine those responses into one document and meet the 218 deadline. That was our original intention if we can

pull it off. If I have to, I'll separate the 219 out. My intention is that all the responses are done by March 23rd. That means that's the day Gina has to sign the letters. They take a couple of days to get through our correspondence system to be archived, mailed, postal mailed. You will all receive a written response. Either electronically or via certified mail.

Susan Jane Brow...: Okay. Thank you for that. I may have additional questions, but I'll turn it over to Doug and Francis.

Doug Heiken; Or...: Francis, do you want to go?

Francis Etherin...: I [crosstalk 00:00:32:41].

Doug Heiken; Or...: Do you want me to go?

Francis Etherin...: Just as an introduction, this is Francis Etherington President of Oregon Women's Land Trust. We own property that is immediately adjacent to the pipeline and only a few miles from the Tiller Ranger District on the Forest Service. We feel as though we're very much impacted by the Forest Services decision.

PART 1 OF 11 ENDS [00:33:04]

Francis: We feel as though we're very much impacted by the forest services decisions here. I don't have any further questions to what Susan Jane had. So, Doug, do you have anything?

Doug: I had a few things I wanted to ask about. One is that, I'm concerned that this project, we're approving plan amendments for a project that may not be in the public interest, and I'm curious how the forest service factors in the general public interest into their decision making on these plan amendments. Does it differ to FERC on that? Could FERC do one thing and the forest service do another thing? And when considering the general public interest, can the forest service consider impacts that are not on public lands or can they only consider effects that are on national forests?

Debbie Anderson: So, let me ask if I understand your question right then. This is Debbie Anderson. So, as far as what's in the public interest for national forest system lands, clearly that's Alice's decision space. I do not believe that the forest service can dictate what's in the public interest off of national forest system lands. However, if I understand what you asked, and I'm looking at Alison, David and they're agreeing with me. So, we do not have the authority to dictate what happens off of national forest system lands as far as what's in the public interest.

Doug: Yeah. I wasn't asking whether you had discretion or influence over things that happen off the lands, but whether you would consider impacts that may be detrimental to the public interest in deciding whether or not to allow this project on public lands. For instance, what if somebody came up with an idea of

doing recreational bomb dropping, and most of the bomb dropping was going to be on non-federal lands, but some of the bombs are going to fall on public lands and there would be a little bit of an impact. And so you need some plan amendments to get this recreational activity going and the forest services considering how to do that. Are they able to exercise discretion to figure out whether this activity is in the public interest? Or when an applicant shows up, knocks on the door and says, "I want to do this," you just feel compelled, oh gee, there's a demand for this recreational activity. So, we might have to meet that demand.

Alice Carlton: So, I...

Debbie Anderson: Can you say your name before you speak?

Alice Carlton: I'm sorry, Debbie, yes, this is Alice Carlton. So, Doug, here's been my approach to this. It's FERC's decision whether or not this entire project is in the public interest. Okay? And so in terms of... That's their part of the analysis, that's their part of the decision making, is whether or not the whole project is in the public interest. And so for the plan amendments, my part of the responsibility is to ensure that any plan amendments that we do that are required to be in the public interest on national forest lands, are in the public's interest just focusing on the national forest piece of it, because FERC makes those overarching decisions and of course each other land agency has that decision space if necessary for them on the properties that they're responsible for. So, that's how I've been looking at this as I proceeded with the project.

Doug: And so is the forest service just [crosstalk 00:36:52].

Dave Span: Go ahead.

Debbie Anderson: Go ahead Doug.

Dave Span: All right Doug, [crosstalk 00:37:00] this is Dave Span. I was just going to elaborate a little bit on... Sorry.

Debbie Anderson: All right...

Dave Span: Go ahead Doug.

Debbie Anderson: Doug, go ahead and speak.

Doug: I'm sorry I'm over speaking, I thought somebody told me to go. Based on what Alice just said, I'm curious if the forest service sees their role as just accommodating whatever finding that FERC makes or could they make a different finding?

Dave Span: So, we don't have a permit. We don't have an application in front of us. We don't have an ability to make a finding specific to the permit itself. There's two agencies that are in charge of that process. One would be FERC under the Natural Gas Act and one would be Bureau Of Land Management as the agent for the department of interior under the mineral leasing act. Our role is to cooperate under the Energy Policy Act with those two respective lead agencies for their decision space.

Dave Span: So, I guess it's a little different and unique in this instance, this project, where folks are used to us having a larger role in making these decisions through our special use permit screening criteria because I hear this from both you and Andy Stall. Looking at those two-step screening criteria which does incorporate in a public benefit or a public interest component and we don't have that in front of us here. Our role is to consider options or opportunities on and off national forest system lands. As Andy mentioned, he wanted to see more decisions or alternatives off national forest system lands and we'll try to bring that stuff out of the record. And for the plan amendments we look at the planning rule criteria and those sustainability requirements under the planning rule, that's our guiding principles and that's Alex's decision space.

Doug: Okay.

Francis: Can I follow [crosstalk 00:39:21] up with a question?

Debbie Anderson: Certainly Francis.

Francis: So, this is Francis. So, from what I understand from this discussion is the forest service does determine public good on forest service lands and FERC determines public good for the entire project. Do I have that right?

Speaker 1: So, it's my responsibility, Francis, to ensure that if I make a decision on a forest plan amendment that I'm meeting the standards set up in the Northwest forest plan and underlying forest plans. And so it's my responsibility to ensure that we have done a complete job with those amendments. Its first responsibility to decide for the American public, whether or not the project is in the benefit to the public.

Francis: So, there will be no separate analysis on if it's a benefit to the public on the national forest decision matrix? It's, it's only [crosstalk 00:40:35].

Dave Span: No, we don't have a [inaudible 00:40:37].

Debbie Anderson: Sorry, go ahead and finish your question Francis.

Francis: I think I finished. It's only for the overall plan for the public good. There will be no analysis on forest service lands for the public good on forest service lands.

Dave Span: That's a question unique to the permitting agent. So, I would ask you folks, when you're dealing with the protest resolution or whatever process with Bureau Of Land Management, these are good questions to ask them because they have the application before them and they are deciding officials for any public interest concepts that are related to authorization the right away. We do not have those requirements. Other than what Alice mentioned, standards that are in the Northwest forest plan and the local standards of those unit plans. So, those are governing principles and a consideration for plan amendments.

Francis: Okay, thank you.

John: What I'm getting from this conversation is that the forest service doesn't have... They're giving up a lot of their discretion to other agencies and to me that really highlights the importance of the point that Andy Stall was making. If there was an alternative that didn't impact national forest land, then they could make a decision that plan amendments we're not worth it in the public interest. But if there's not an alternative that excludes public lands, then the forest service is forced to accept the project that may not be in the public interest regardless.

Dave Span: Well one clarifying comments on that. It's not us giving up anything, it's Congress telling us what to do in [inaudible 00:42:29] statutes. So, the forest service is delegated certain responsibilities as you know, through statutory mandates, and in this instance we are tethered a little more than our usual decisions based on a project.

John: But you would be less tethered if there were alternatives that didn't impact national forest lands.

Dave Span: Well, we do think there are alternatives out there and we will provide those, like I said to Andy, but there were considerations that go back. So, John, and here's a little bit more of the story. This is the third iteration of this project, right? So, there's been a lot of work and consideration of alternatives designed to avoid national forest system lands specifically that didn't get highlighted in the EIS very obviously. It was lumped together with a non-federal land alternative. And so we can respond to that with some specificity on individual routes contemplated to avoid each of the national forest system units.

Dave Span: Just bear with us through this process because we've got a lot on our plate and we still have to work through all of these objections and then provide this narrative back to you folks in a formal or official way.

John: Okay. I don't have anything more.

Susan Jane: This is Susan. Jane. I have another question before we finish up with our objection if that's all right?

Debbie Anderson: Yeah, you have adequate time remaining, Susan Jane.

Susan Jane: Great. So, since we're supposed to be talking specifically about forest wide amendments this morning and project specific later this afternoon, the forest wide amendments basically shift matrix land into LSR and so that is, I guess I would say a permanent decision as opposed to the project specific which only apply to this particular pipeline project. But once those forest wide amendments are finalized, then that is a permanent change into the future on those forests, in those forest plans. And so my question is what happens to those forest plan amendments that are forest wide if the project is not built? Either because FERC denies the certificate or because of litigation that stops the pipeline or state disapproval of necessary permits, which the applicant doesn't have any permits from the state at this point in time.

Susan Jane: So, what happens to those amendments if the project is not constructed? Does that land that has been shifted from matrix to LSR stay as LSR or do you think that there would be some sort of additional amendment process that would change that land back? Or would you leave it alone? What happens?

Dave Span: Yeah [crosstalk 00:12:57], sure. Yeah. I mean this is a concept that we tiered off from, from the forest back East and I've seen it other places that we make these plan amendments. If, let's just, I don't like to play hypotheticals here, but if Alice were to sign a decision on the plan amendments, they would not become operative or effective until the right of way grant is issued. So, therefore they do not exist, even if Alice puts pen or ink on the paper to sign these things, they don't become effective until that right of way grant is signed by all parties. So, that's hypothetically,

Susan Jane: So, when you say right of way grant, are you talking about BLM's right of way authorization? Or are you talking about something else?

Dave Span: I am talking about the right away authorization.

Susan Jane: From BLM.

Debbie Anderson: Good clarity.

Dave Span: Yeah, so that's not even the decision to issue the right of way authorization. That is the actual authorization that would be the final step, well almost the final step, because there's a notice to proceed that BLM would issue after the right of way authorization, but that would be the legal instrument that would make these plan amendments effective, would be that right of way authorization that's signed by both Pembina and the Bureau of Land Management as the agent for department of interior.

Susan Jane: So, is it... [crosstalk 00:00:47:21]. Sorry, go ahead.

Francis: This is Francis. Does that come before or after the FERC certification?

Susan Jane: Yeah, because I think, part of the question that I have, and I think this is what Francis is getting at is that, and again, yes we have been through this several times including a time when FERC issued a certificate and the project didn't get built. And so I don't know [inaudible 00:47:49] the signatures on the BLM right of way is in fact the last thing that needs to happen. Certainly if the certificate issues it will be conditioned on obtaining all of the necessary permits. I'm just concerned that the right of way authorization or the right of way will be signed authorizing these plan amendments that may be premature. So, I'm just trying to figure that out so that I can track it internally.

Debbie Anderson: Good question. And this is Debbie again and I can address that. So, Alice's decision will have both the permanent amendment from matrix to LSR and the plan level amendments which apply to the project only. If the project never gets built, those amendments will go back, they'll go away in effect because they only apply to the right of way. So, the visual quality objective amendments, if we're not building the pipeline, we have no need to amend the plan. Makes sense?

Susan Jane: Yep.

Debbie Anderson: Okay, so that would just go away. The permanent amendment authorizing the matrix to LSR, there could be an administrative action. So, say the project goes away, there could be an administrative action that Alice takes to withdraw that decision and say this is no longer needed because the project wasn't built.

Susan Jane: Yeah. Okay.

Dave Span: [crosstalk 00:49:19] answer. This is stepping out of my lane a little bit, but to answer the greater question, Susan, when you're talking about the chicken or the egg here, who goes first, FERC or DOI? And what I see based on these infrastructure authorities, and you've probably heard of one federal decision, which is executive order and fixing America's infrastructure act, specifically provision 41, which requires us to all set up a timetable and coordinate decisions.

Dave Span: So, we are all queued up behind FERC. So, if FERC doesn't issue a certificate, those overarching authorities, for instance, infrastructure, they wouldn't require DOI to act until FERC acts essentially. So, I think in the backdrop with those authorities guiding this process because it is a one federal decision project and what's called a Fast 41 Project, without FERC acting, there is no impetus for DOI to act on the right away grant.

Susan Jane: Okay. Okay. Thank you for that. That's helpful. I think those are the last of my questions.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. I'll go back to both Doug and Francis. Doug, you first, do you have any additional questions at this time particularly related to resolution?

Doug: No, nothing further.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. Thank you. And Francis?

Francis: No, I have no further questions. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. All right. Thank you. Okay. At this time we are still ahead of schedule with everyone's permission, I know half of you can't answer me. We are going to take a quick break so that people in this office can run to the restroom or fill up their coffee mugs if needed. So, if everyone can just stay on the line, we'll resume in I think five minutes. We'll resume... Let's see, according to my clock, we will resume at 10:15 so we will just come back as soon as it's 10:15 and resumed with George Sexton and Brodia Mentor who will be our next speakers. So, Macy, if you can mute the phone lines at this time.

Macy: We are now connected again. George you may go ahead.

George: Good morning. Thank you for taking the time.

Debbie Anderson: Good morning George.

George: Good morning. I really appreciate Debbie putting this together and thank you for being on the line, Alice, David, Gina, Michael, I've met some of you, but those that I haven't, hope to meet you and I would appreciate it if we could do these kinds of calls or get these kind of issues out on the table in some context, other than an objection resolution meeting.

George: Here in Southwestern Oregon and Northwestern California where we work, we [inaudible 00:52:51] Wildland Center tries to be as involved as we can in both collaborative efforts with the forest service, early planning, left hand side planning and with bringing some stewardship to the table where we'll work in the field, improving and maintaining grazing infrastructure, trail maintenance, bringing volunteers to stewardship on protection projects, finding funding for projects like national forest resiliency, being a partner in that planning effort.

George: And that's work that we do to support public lands managers and to support public lands, because we appreciate your efforts to steward our public lands and we want to be a part of those planning and implementing that stewardship in a meaningful way. So, I always like to thank you for your service to public lands, but I would like to point out that for many people, this planning process makes those kinds of partnerships and collaborations more difficult.

George: From an outside of the agency perspective on this planning process, it's been extremely byzantine and technical and I'm paid full time to interact with the agencies and advocate for public lands, and so this is probably the several hundredth EIS that I've read in my lifetime. It's still not an easy record to get through and even signing up for this call was difficult to tell you the truth. And I

say that because we, the public or conservation community or people who want to be your allies, who are stakeholders and want to collaborate with the agency to achieve that dipper [Pincho 00:54:53] vision. The greatest good and the greatest number over the long term for the agency and for the public lands that you're managing, this project doesn't help you. It makes people who want to be your partners feel excluded from meaningful project planning.

George: The project has an air of inevitability about it, is that there's a preordained outcome and that that preordained outcome is to take existing RMPs that were developed in a public process and changed the standards and guidelines, and in this case this morning, the land use allocations at the behest of an energy company, who had no involvement in the development of those resource management plans and doesn't have the interests of anyone other than the energy company at heart.

George: And so I don't know how to interact best with the forest service in that context. So, what we've tried to do is we tried to send in scoping comments, we tried to take the forest service documents and make them understandable and digestible to the public and our supporters. Have reading sessions, have commenting sessions, allow people to ask questions, try and provide mechanisms for people who utilize El Yunque National Forest, the [inaudible 00:56:24] National Forest, the Fremont-Winema National Forest, to interact with project planners in a way that would be meaningful.

George: And I guess my question is, do you feel like that interaction has been meaningful? Or are we merely hamsters on a wheel doing the bidding of the an embra to get to an outcome that's going to take resource management plans that everyone works on to develop, to change the standards and guidelines of those resource management plans, such that the resource management plans don't do what they were intended to do to begin with. And I hope that that doesn't come out as too pointed because it's a serious question. I've been doing this work for 20 years, I'm going to do it for another 20 and I'd like to know how to interact with the forest service in a meaningful way and facilitate meaningful public interaction in these types of planning processes.

Alice Carlton: So, this is Alice, George, thank you for that background and for my bit, so that you can increase my understanding of your general sense of how the project has unfolded and is unfolding. And I want to just address your question, do we feel that the interaction that you've been having with other public's has been helpful? And, and so let say again that it's difficult, I believe for all of us when we're engaged in a project process that's different than what we normally do and it doesn't have all of the authorities left to myself as a responsible official, that we would normally have, right?

Alice Carlton: And so, it's my belief in general that as special interest groups and partners work with the public and help to engage the public in natural resources and how important they are for the people and help to bridge. We are always trying to bridge to the citizens and to our user base.

Alice Carlton: I'll tell you, just on a personal note, I'm always somewhat saddened by the data that comes out about just our youth, about how young people that live in rural areas don't engage and don't even drive up onto their national forests or their Bureau of Land Management lands or their park service or anything like that, right? So, any help that partners have to help engage people in the interest of the national forest on, is great with me. And I really appreciate that effort. I understand this is a difficult process. We are working to make it as transparent as possible for you and for others, so I appreciate you participating today with us and.

Alice Carlton: And again, I want to say that we are all engaged in this process with you today in an open way so that we can hear and understand again... I'd really like to hear resolution ideas about these and even at that, even if we don't hear resolution ideas, at least I can understand in more specific ways what your concerns are, right? So, that's helpful for us all who are joining with you today. So, what part of your question did I maybe not answer very well? Or what other questions do you have?

George: No, I think you took a honest stab at it and I really appreciate it and I tell you what, I think that a lot of us at this table feel, not just the agency and not just the folks who have taken the time to try and participate in the process, feel like our hands are a bit tied here. And I wish you luck in trying to thread that needle. I don't think that you've been tasked with an easy or desirable role, and I wish that there were things that the interested public and people who care about public lands could be doing to increase your decision space and to allow you the flexibility to achieve the mission of the agency. And that's something that we're going to commit to doing through the political process and through the legal process and through public organizing.

George: So, we're going to do our best to help the agency not get steamrolled and that's about the best I can offer you. I guess I'd also say in a larger context, we're going to advocate for funding for the forest service. Down here in, I know it's the same on the [inaudible 01:01:50] on the Rogue Siskiyou, about 40% of the positions are vacant currently and it's pretty grim. Like I was innervating at the beginning of, you want trails maintained, it's public and stewardship folks who are really holding the weight on that. And that's same thing for your roads maintenance budget, your recreation budget, it all looks pretty grim and we know that you're working in a shadow and appreciate that you're doing your best in difficult circumstances.

George: And I guess the point I was trying to make is I'm hearing you on youth engagement, public engagement and processes like these, I'm sure feel disempowering for the agency and they feel maybe doubly so for the public.

George: And so the young people that we have out on the ground at the Eight Dollar Mountain Botanica area on the side of the Illinois River, in the Rogue River–Siskiyou National Forest, cleaning up trash, trying to get the motor vehicle use map to be a reality on the ground, fighting the spread of invasive species, doing

trail and transportation management. If we wanted to build a trail there, the NEPA Fort would be an insurmountable burden and it's an unfortunate fact.

George: And if we were to ask those young people to engage in this process and many of them have, particularly road climate, an organization down here is run by and for young people for whom climate change is an impact to their lives, not to other people's lives or other people's standards of living, it's young people trying to engage in the climate change crisis directly. And many of them have participated in this process and I can guarantee you none of them feel empowered or heard or that their engagement has been meaningful.

George: And that's, I guess the take home I would ask you to take from this call or from my comments, is that in Southern Oregon, there's, I would say a hunger from the conservation community and volunteers and young people and old people and berger's and hikers and hook and bullet folks, opera vehicle enthusiasts, to partner with the forest service and figure out ways to arrest the slide into nowhere that's going on with agency funding and agency management and planning processes like this make it harder, not easier. There needs to be... It, from the outside, looks like pacific connector of [embra 01:04:56] get what they want because they have a bunch of money and a bunch of power and that participating in the NEPA process, doing volunteer stewardship, having these calls... But it's all hoops that you guys are directed to go through both through regulation and funding.

George: And so I'm suggesting that we try and figure out ways to empower public participation in these things that's more meaningful than maybe what's occurred. And I think in the long run, that's going to build you alliances and partners and allies and people who will continue and maybe can increase the voice for supporting public land managers and supporting public lands management, to fill that mission of the greatest good for the greatest number, over the longest time. And get off my soap box now. I guess I have one more [inaudible 01:06:01] question now, which is I'm wondering if...

PART 2 OF 11 ENDS [01:06:04]

George Sexton: More substantive question now, which is, I'm wondering if there is ... The decision space is so narrow that the forest service could not choose to implement the existing RMPs as written.

Alice Carlton: basically not take action. I think you said suggestions, George, am I correct as in not take any action, not approve a plan amendment? Is that what you're suggesting?

George Sexton: Oh, very close. I'm wondering if the decision could be to implement your existing resource management plans ... as written.

Alice Carlton: Right. So, George, well, others may think that my answer to that is foolhardy. I will tell you what I believe is my duty and my responsibility for this project, and that is to really consider the breadth of options in front of me, which includes the no action alternative. And it's my approach and my belief that I always have the ability to choose whatever of those alternatives or options that are in front of me that I think is the appropriate stance for meetings, the laws and the regulations and the requests of the national forest to steward the land and provide public service and all of our mission work. So, do I feel that I have the ability to choose a no action? And I would say I feel like I have the responsibility to choose any option.

Alice Carlton: That is what I need to choose in order to meet and balance all those requirements. Right? So it's interesting that you asked me this question because while you were finishing your describing the piece on the public engagement, and I kept thinking, should I also answer him that the risk for the scope of the decision that I do have, that I feel fully responsible and I would not choose any of the action alternatives. I wouldn't choose a forest plan amendments or any of those if I didn't feel that our primary responsibility for meeting stewardship of the national forest, if we weren't able to do that, I wouldn't choose those. So I wouldn't amend ... I wouldn't propose these amendments or I wouldn't ... I shouldn't say that. I wouldn't choose any alternative that proposed to amend the plan if I didn't believe that our primary responsibility of stewardship of it, of the three forests, I wasn't meaning that.

Alice Carlton: So I just want you to know that, and so I do think that with those, I think with those plan amendments. Now, we've worked hard to reroute, to finesse the route to avoid watershed issues and Native American dilemmas and all kinds of social economic and that's what resource decisions. So, I want you to know that if, if it came down to it, yes, I believe the only way to carry out the responsibilities that are on my shoulders to those three forests. I do have the ability to choose that no action alternative and I would do that.

George Sexton: Well, I sure appreciate your response and I wish you luck with all the things you have to deal with here I don't envy your task. I think we're still under our time and I don't think that we have anything more for you right now for the afternoon session. You know, we're going to have a couple of questions for you and one of them is going to involve the roads route alternative that was not carried forward, that was proposed by I believe the river Siskiyou National Forest. So maybe just a little foreshadowing of what we might ask about this afternoon, but we'll yield the rest of our time, and thanks again for hearing us out this morning and allowing us to participate this afternoon as well.

Alice Carlton: So, thanks George. And you know, we don't cross our paths very much, but I just want to tell you that I think the work that's going on in the rogue basin with all the consensus and the collaborative natures and the Ashland Restoration Project and your involvement in all that and of all the partners has been really great. So I want to just let you know that, from a distance, I look at that and I think it's really great work. So, thanks for that.

George Sexton: Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: George, this is Debbie Anderson again, is Brodia going to speak now or later? I want to make sure that we give you your full time.

Brodia Minter: Hi Debbie. This is Brodia. Yeah, thank you. I'm going to leave what George said ringing thanks.

Debbie Anderson: Okay, thank you. And George, I do want to address your concern about the difficulty getting on this call. So I just, and I know this resonates with all of the objectors. When we tried to set up a resolution meeting, we were trying to anticipate having everyone attend, which was up to about 200 eligible objectors or so. We don't have a phone line system that can accommodate that many lines without technical difficulties in the least, so this was the only option we could figure out to allow people to participate without having chaos and open phone lines where people talked over each other the entire time.

Debbie Anderson: So I apologize. It was difficult for us. We, as in me, for objections have never hosted a meeting this way. This has been a learning curve for me entirely and I deeply apologize for any inconvenience that this has been or any difficulties, but given the number that we anticipated, of course that didn't materialize, but given the number of participants we anticipated this was a logical option that we could go with and given the current health situation that's out there in public, I'm kind of grateful we're not at some large public meeting at this point, as well, given the viruses that are going around. So, that said, I'll get better at this if we have to do this again, but thank you all for your patience. I know this has been a struggle and I know there's been a lot of last minute things, but given the number and nature of the objections, it was just, it was difficult to coordinate both processes at once. So I apologize. We will get better. We'll try to do better next time, George.

George Sexton: Well, we know that everyone's doing their best, and it couldn't have been easy, and thank you for responding real quickly and helpfully, then. That's the slew of email questions I've had for you, so thanks again.

Debbie Anderson: Thanks George. Thanks Brodia. Okay, so let's see. Next on the agenda we have Jesse Ratcliffe and Sarah, I want to get her name right. Sarah Reif from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. So I don't know if both Jesse and Sarah are on, but I see at least Sarah has registered. So if you could open hers and if Jesse's on also that phone line, we will go ahead and have the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Go ahead.

Macy: I had Sarah Reif on the phone.

Sarah Reif: Okay, good morning. Hi, this is Sarah Reif with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Jesse Ratcliffe with Department of Justice is unable to be on the call this morning. He will be on the call this afternoon, so I'll go ahead and speak on

behalf of the state. I'm the energy coordinator with ODFW and I've been the lead reviewer on this project. I have some prepared comments for today. I hope they're specific enough and that they speak to resolutions enough. Admittedly, we weren't entirely clear what to expect from this unique forum format. I wasn't sure that there was going to be opportunities for back and forth with the forest service today. So I kind of wished we would have prepared more questions for you all or more interactive discussion. But I'm glad to hear that there'll be a thorough objection review going on in the background because there won't be adequate time today to get into the details below the 30,000 foot level, and I guess to that point I do have one question, will there be more opportunity for direct contact and meetings between the forest service and ODFW to further explore these suggested resolutions?

Debbie Anderson: So this is Debbie Anderson. I'll answer that part from the regional office level. This is the only formal meeting that we'll be able to have due to both timelines, timeframes and availability. But if there are additional discussions after today that, for example, David and Alice can help answer further questions, then absolutely there will be time to answer additional questions and have further dialogue there, but we won't be able to hold any more formal meetings with all of the objectors' presence. But additional questions and answers can certainly happen up until the time we issue the written response. And even after that, because the written response is just to be objection. If there's additional dialogue ODFW wants to have then Alice and David would, that would be their ability to accommodate that as with any objectors or interest groups after the objection response is done.

Alice Carlton: Absolutely.

Sarah Reif: Okay. Thank you. Sorry I missed that.

Alice Carlton: Oh, Oh, I'm sorry. This is Alice Carlton. Sarah, I just wanted for you and for the objectors to hear, for me of what Debbie said is right. We are here through the process. What we want to do is resolve these objections and dilemmas as they come up so that we have a good solid footing going forward.

Sarah Reif: Thank you. I appreciate that. So the issues raised in ODFW's objection are a significant concern to the state, and the decision to object to the plan amendments was not taken lightly. We really value our working relationship with the federal resource agencies, with the forest service in particular. We've had a strong foundation for working together over the years and we expect that our concerns will be addressed with that relationship in mind. We certainly appreciate all the work that you do and appreciate the opportunity today. I think our most immediate concerns with the EIS are at the project level, the effects of the project, but it is the plan level amendments that create the potential for similar concerns arising in the future and the precedent that they set. So, you're likely going to hear similar comments from us both this morning and this afternoon, and for the plan level discussion today, it's really about the

precedent and what the approval for this for this project might mean for future approvals.

Sarah Reif: The points outlined under ODFW in today's agenda, those do hit on most of our suggested resolutions or objection issues, as well as what we provided in our letters. So in the interest of time, I won't repeat all of those, but I will raise two additional important issues in need of resolution that you did not include in your list. One is that the selected alternative, the Blue Ridge variation, was not fully analyzed in the effects analysis, at least to the extent that ODFW was able to find the information that it would need particularly as it relates to forest plan standards for the marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl as well as listed fish: coastal martin and Pacific fisher. There are some missing acreages, some missing effects analyses that we believe need resolution.

Sarah Reif: Also, what's not mentioned in your list in the agenda is that the project will impact suitable nesting habitat for marbled murrelet and nesting activity centers for northern spotted owl within what you currently have designated as late successional reserves. Those occupied habitats within the LSR are considered category one habitat in the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife habitat mitigation policy. ODFW considers those habitats to be essential, limited, and irreplaceable within a reasonable timeframe, and those are the terms that make up the definition of category one habitat according to our fish and wildlife habitat mitigation policy and impacts the category one habitat for these species could result in serious depletion of the species within the state of Oregon. We don't find that impacts those habitats would be consistent with the state of Oregon's wildlife policy. And that would be in statute.

Sarah Reif: So, to resolve that we recommend avoidance of loss of occupied late successional reserve habitat for the marbled murrelet and the northern spotted owl, and that you consider alternative siting of the right of way that avoid impacts to those habitats.

Debbie Anderson: So Sarah, this is Debbie Anderson. I think we can address the Blue Ridge variation at this point. So I'm going to turn it over to David on that.

David: Yeah, in short, it's not on forest service land, it's not even adjacent to forest service lands. Something like 30 miles away from the Umpqua National Forest.

Sarah Reif: Okay, thank you. Well, yeah, we combined our comments to BLM and forest service. So I'm pulling from one letter. I apologize if that's not within your scope.

Debbie Anderson: No worries. Yeah, that's what we're here for. So that's why I didn't [crosstalk 01:21:18].

Sarah Reif: Yeah, well there's a softball for ya. So then I guess that's the long and short of it and not wanting to take too much time today and not really knowing what level

of detail to get into. But if you have any questions of me or any clarification you'd like from ODFW, I'd be happy to try and answer any questions.

Debbie Anderson: So Sarah, this is Debbie again. So just on your second point also, you did mention the murrelet impact, and to be clear, there's no national forest system land that's west of I-5 that would be affected. So, that's why the murrelets aren't addressed for NFS land. Just to be clear, when you see the response document, you'll see that we did not address that for that reason. So I just want to be clear on that, that we won't provide a written response to objection issues that were not in the scope of the forest service. So you're not surprised by that. I do think that we had a question and wanted to talk about potentially the crosswalk that you propose, that ODFW proposed, and I think David, did you have a follow up question on that?

David: Oh just giving us some definition of what you're looking for there. This is the first time we've heard of that comment coming in, I believe. I didn't see that in the scoping or DEI of comment on a crosswalk. So one wasn't prepared, but what are you looking for there and how could we resolve that concern that you have.

Alice Carlton: We can engage later if you don't have all the details now but we would be really interested in engaging with you in particular on that point. And then also on the added points that you bring up that you included murrelets, but also avoiding northern spotted owl sites. Certainly I'm not sure which sites that you're talking about because some are not under our jurisdiction and some are, but we'd be happy to work with you on your thoughts about those sites that are on a national forest site.

Sarah Reif: I think that's where additional interactions so that we can pore over maps and be talking site specifics would probably be most beneficial. But in terms of a crosswalk with the state's fish and wildlife habitat mitigation policy, that is something we've been recommending since the dawn of this project. The applicant's very well aware of this recommendation, which is that there be a mapping of the right of way, mapping of habitat categories according to our policy for the whole right of way and they have done that. They have a draft version of that that they did not bring forward for inclusion in this environmental impact statement. So it's not that we'd be starting from the beginning, it would be that the applicant has contended that they did not need to address the state's concerns on federal lands. So there are data that we can use to do that crosswalk.

Sarah Reif: Last I knew, there was a draft map of the habitat categorization that needed some additional corrections and tweaking but fairly minor. So, we could pick up that effort, and then what that amounts to, once you have the habitat categorization done, you then can look at what might be needed in terms of mitigation offsets. First of all, what can't be mitigated for that would be category one, but then as you work down categories there's different goals, be

it in kind mitigation, in proximity, no net loss, and so it's a way of ensuring that ultimately the impacts to fish wildlife and their habitats are offset.

Alice Carlton: So we can certainly work with the state further on that concept, right?

Sarah Reif: Absolutely, yeah. I mean, you can, you can have that additional dialogue moving forward.

David: Sure. You could just put a little backdrop on that Sarah. I know I was contacted from ODF&W folks just in general on habitat types and we provided data on the vegetation types that were going to be impacted on national forest system lands, and they were looking for a dry eastern slope type sage or I guess the great basis steppe type environments to be compensated, and we simply didn't have any of that, and we expressed the type of habitats that we do have that are being impacted.

David: I didn't get much follow up from your folks saying anything in particular that they were looking for in the way of mitigation because as we were jetting up mitigation projects under our program and policies which do work with ODF&W on prioritization of those projects. It just didn't materialize into anything concrete for us to incorporate into our documents. I've stepped through the draft to finally IF, so not saying that it's not out there, but we did have some interaction back and forth correspondence with you folks. So let's just continue that dialogue and see what we can do to maximum extent practicable given our sideboards from the forest services standpoint.

Sarah Reif: Right. That sounds good, David. I think we have in the past provided feedback that the mitigation proposed by the forest service was not, in all cases, meeting the in time, in proximity goals of our policy and that we were requesting additional dialogue on that. I think I can pull that out of our various scoping comment letters, but I do very much appreciate your responsiveness to that today and look forward to continuing to work with y'all on that.

Alice Carlton: Thank you, Sarah. This is Alice. I appreciate that and we'll be in touch.

Sarah Reif: Great. With that, I don't have any more. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: All right. Thank you. Okay, we're still a little bit ahead of schedule, so I'm going to hope that the next two folks are on the line. So Macy, if you could open Denise's phone line.

Macy: Denise, you may go ahead.

Denise Tschann: Hello, I'm Denise Tschann, and I really have to thank you for being here and offering this time to us. I did prepare something that was more like when I testified directed to [inaudible 01:28:45], and so I'm sitting here trying to

unscramble it so it will make sense to you as well. I originally had said that you can hear me okay?

Alice Carlton: Yes we can. Thank you.

Denise Tschann: Okay, thank you. I originally had stated that I wanted to ask that the project meets standards and guidelines of the existing management plan or be denied, and I've reconsidered that a lot because I've come in contact with a lot of other information and I think that I love the land, and I don't want it altered. That's true, but I think more important is community safety over this project. I have a lot of fears about the reality of the safety of transporting a liquified fuel, pressurized through reinforced pipeline. Yes, they're reinforced but through our mountains and under our rivers to slide zones over seismic ... We sent it as sensitive terrain and to an area that has a tinderbox essential if any on observed gas leaks occur.

Denise Tschann: I'm concerned really about the possible danger of ignition of some of these gases if there is a small leak and the explosive power and the fire. Some of my fears are stoked by some high profile things that have happened, like the Lac-Mégantic just outside of Quebec, and that happened early in like 2012 or 13 and immediately 47 individuals were dead. The village, the downtown of the village, was destroyed by a blast. That was a rail car accident, however, and I realized that's more dangerous than the pipelines, but still the pipelines through our country, through our Oregon or different.

Denise Tschann: Then there're leaks at the [inaudible] export terminal on the Gulf of Mexico, and they haven't even been fined for the leaks in their terminal tanks. And then other things such as the Keystone spills. I mean, there've been four or five of them. One of them in October 29th of 2019 was 383,000 gallons of crude oil into the wetlands in North Dakota. And another one in South Dakota was 407,000 gallons. Then there were two other spills, so my real concern is, yes, I love the forest. Yes, I don't want to be have it torn up, but I'm really concerned about the safety of our state, and I also want to piggy back on top of the [inaudible 01:31:48] wild.

Denise Tschann: I know that [inaudible 01:31:50] preserves in most Eastern Oregon and the Steens Mountain preserve in southeast Oregon are examples of the positive results of groups working together, talking together, and not just scattered as we are. Where they actually physically meet together and get to know one another and then come to a resolution of what works for the ranchers, the farmers, the conservationists, and the environment. I feel like we're being denied that in a sense.

Denise Tschann: I know I'm saying a lot in a short period of time, but I guess my comment is I feel helpless at this point that I'm not going to be protected. I know on August 28th of 2019 a magnitude 6.3 Earthquake located off the coast of southern Oregon near Bandon, which sailed all the way to Seattle. Then in 2019 there were 256 earthquakes in 365 days in Oregon and they were minor, but that's almost a

daily movement. I feel that the physical features in geology of Southern Oregon and the coastal Oregon create a landscape for us that's really truly unsuitable for this project.

Denise Tschann: In the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, I read an evaluation of the Jordan Cove plans and they feel that Pembina didn't look at the Millis Report, that their statement was geologically, the fourth County region in Southwestern Oregon is a very active area for natural disasters like the Cascadia earthquake, and it's not that it's not going to happen, it's when it's going to happen. So, these things concern me, and I know it wasn't exactly the answer that I was expected to give, but I'm confused and I'm uncomfortable with even putting any part of this project in because of the possible mega disaster that it could because if there is an earthquake, if there's a tsunami, it's going to be the biggest concern other than the fact that all of our oil and gas in the state of Oregon is sitting on reclaimed land at the mouth of the Willamette. Those two pieces just going to take everything away from us. Do you have a question for me?

Alice Carlton: Well, this is Alice Carlton. Denise, I want to thank you for your comments and your heartfelt feeling of what can one person do. I suspect every one of us as a human being feels that way at some point and time in life, right? Michael's nodding his head, so I want to just acknowledge that you're taking the time and the effort to come in front of us today. That's huge, and I am aware that remarks like this could come across as patronizing, and I'm sorry if they do because that's certainly not my intention. What I've heard from you is that you really value the public lands, these beautiful spaces, that you value Southwest Oregon as an entire landscape, and that you really support collaborative processes that get people to come together to establish the things like some of the preserves, and that you really appreciate those types of projects of resolutions. I think that's a lot, if I might interpret of what George Sexton before you was talking about, as well.

Alice Carlton: I've also heard that a deeper concern you have is for the public welfare and safety of all of us in southwest Oregon and in Oregon in general, and, probably I suspect with you, larger than that in this country, and that you feel that the landscapes in southwestern Oregon are, are not stable enough to sustain a project through time of this kind of magnitude and having gas running through it. You talked a lot about the different reasons from above surface concerns, like fires, to below surface concerns, like slide zones, seismic zones, the ability against surface leaks, spills, tsunamis at Jordan Cove, and so on. This decision of public benefit is larger than the forest service, and yet I take your comments as really sincere, and I see here that you suggested resolutions because of the nature of your deep concerns are to deny the project or to prepare a project that meets the standards and guidelines of the existing land use management plans. So, I take those suggestions if you have anything else that we can do that towards resolutions, I'd be happy to hear those as well.

Denise Tschann: I want to send all my notes to you and have you always prepare them., You said it's so much better than me and I thank you. Again, I think George Sexton's suggestion is true. I have seen groups work together for very successful projects in this state. Thank you.

Alice Carlton: Anything else? Thanks Denise.

Denise Tschann: I have no idea. I can't think of anything else. I think you said it, and I think you interpreted it very well. Very clearly. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: So Debbie, this is Denise. I just want to thank you again for your patience as we worked to get you the conference line information. So again, to all objectors. Thank you again. So with that, Macy, we can move on to the next objector, Rianna Koppel.

Macy: Rianna, you may go ahead.

Rianna Koppel: Hi everyone. A big thank you to the objection reviewing officer, the responsible officials here, facilitators, and of course all the authorities and objectors on the line. I realize this is a long and ...

PART 3 OF 11 ENDS [01:39:04]

Rianna Koppel: Ortiz and objectors on the line. I realize this is a long and complex call, so thanks for all being here today.

Rianna Koppel: I am here this morning to request that the forest service completely withdraw the recommended project and completely deny the Pacific connector gas pipeline project and any related forest plan or land and resource management land amendments.

Rianna Koppel: Just to give a little bit of backstory, on November 21st of last year, myself and 20 other people were arrested in governor Kate Brown's office. Our ages range from students in their early twenties to retired folks in their seventies. One of the folks arrested was an impacted landowner who has been fighting this pipeline for over 15 years. Myself and all these others arrested did so because we have been attempting in every possible way to voice our opposition to the pipeline. There were only 21 people arrested. Still, that's a lot, but there are hundreds more.

Rianna Koppel: Let their voice be heard at the Capitol on that day on and specifically for governor Kate Brown.

Rianna Koppel: So personally, I have voiced my opposition to this pipeline at the Capitol, at the department of state lands in written comments in recorded comment.

Rianna Koppel: And I'm here again today to ask the forest service to completely withdraw this project and deny this.

Rianna Koppel: One of the things that I wanted to mention that I haven't heard on this call so far today has to do with the tribe, the Klamath tribes, the Yurok tribes, Koruk-tribes, Confederated tribes, and still that's Indian. And the Tullow ADI nation have all declared strong opposition to this project.

Rianna Koppel: And I noticed that in the final environmental impact statement draft decision in appendix F-11 that was released the same month that we were all arrested. It states that consultations between FERC staff and Indian tribes are still ongoing.

Rianna Koppel: And then it says that FERC has developed a programmatic agreement to resolve the adverse effects for the Pacific connector gas pipeline as a whole, and that there will be stipulations that will be implemented in order to take all this into an account. So I'm really curious as to what this PA is. Is that something that's a forest service has any kind of jurisdiction over and what the resolving adverse effects for the pipeline means? Exactly.

Debbie: Thank you, Rhiannon. I'm going to have David Krantz or Alice Carlton address that.

David Krantz: Yeah. There's a draft program, programmatic agreement that's still ongoing with all that all the agencies have jurisdiction with the project and it has no timeline for completion. I anticipate that would have it completed when the issue, if they issue a certificate I should say. So we're still waiting from first to see the final product that we provided input as well as the tribe did. Like I said earlier, our decision space is very narrow on plan amendments, so it's really being guided on the land management side by the Bureau of land management. So that would be a question for the Bureau of land management to provide you any specificity on that programmatic agreement. While we are our finger on it, we are in a concurrence capacity and not a decision maker.

Rianna Koppel: So you're able to sign off on the project, but you are not able to have any kind of implementation for this PA. I'm trying to understand how you could sign off on the PA or if that is something that's written into your jurisdiction that you are required to in order to cooperate with BLM.

David Krantz: Well, if we add plan amendments that concerns, heritage resources, that's where our rub is for input into that programmatic agreement. The other side of it is in a communication protocol for the Bureau of land management to communicate to us for actions that may trigger provisions of that programmatic agreement. So it's a different approach because your land management has that decision making authority and we do not that we would be communicated to. Let's say if there's a staff order because of a significant fine and a tribe is notified, we would be notified in our cultural staff. We'd be on site to review that concern and work with the tribes that are affected and work with the

Bureau of land management. But ultimately because your land management is the permit holder for this project, they would make the final call.

- Rianna Koppel: Okay. Thank you for the explanation for that. That's my concern and comment and question in terms of the fine details from that environment impact statement, but at that broader, 30,000 foot level. But we have also been talking about, I am really concerned about our national forest system, including of course the beautiful rogue river and the Siskiyou national forest where I live in Jackson County. These lands would be permanently impacted by this proposal from a foreign energy company and I do object to my public lands being sold to a Canadian pipeline company that's planning to sell their fossil fuels to an international market at the expense of Oregonian and at the expense of our public lands.
- Rianna Koppel: If this pipeline and project in Jordan Cove was completed, it would be the greatest contributor to fossil fuel emissions in the state. And of course with all the wildfires that we have seen over the past few years, and of course myself here in Jackson County, not this summer, but the summer previously in 2018 we saw a six to eight weeks of fires that completely destroyed our economy.
- Rianna Koppel: And that is something that I really see as not being taken into effect in this environmental impact statement, which is that these wildfires are caused by climate change, which are caused by fossil fuel emissions.
- Rianna Koppel: And so I wouldn't understand that and I can't understand why the forest service would want to approve or even consider amendment for proposed foreign company to create a gas pipeline that would add to already high fossil fuel emissions in the state that is causing direct economic impact and of course air impact in all of the environmental impacts.
- Rianna Koppel: So kind of just to reiterate that, if the forest service chooses to amend their plans in order to facilitate and accommodate this specific connector pipeline route, essentially the forest service is choosing to promote foreign corporate fossil fuel interests other than upholding and protecting the public land, Perkins and the very strong opposition that has been raised from Oregonians for over 15 years, including arrests.
- Rianna Koppel: That just happened very recently. And so kind of regarding this on page 33 of this draft decision very, very briefly, it talks about the no action alternative, which I also heard us talking about on a call today.
- Rianna Koppel: And from my understanding it, it basically States that if the pipeline is not constructed, Jordan Cove or other LNG companies, most likely foreign, will find another way to export this natural gas to Asia so that another LNG project could be proposed to the department of energy and be constructed.

Rianna Koppel: And just that we couldn't really seriously consider the no action alternative to purely because another company could jump up and try to do the same thing. I was really surprised to read this, especially after hearing earlier on the call today, that it is the responsibility of the forest service to choose an option to meet and balance all these requirements.

Rianna Koppel: And there's a primary responsibility for meeting the stewardship of national forest.

Rianna Koppel: As far as I understand, there's not any other Pacific natural gas pipeline proposals that are happening right now today.

Rianna Koppel: There's this one that has been happening for the past 15 years and I just have this question of why is the no action alternative has really been, it seems to me set to the side in this entire environmental impact statement and if we are really meeting the stewardship of national forest, which is the mission statement of the forest service to sustain the health and diversity and productivity of our nation's forests and of course to meet the needs of present and future generations. I'm not understanding why the first answer should have been no, to a corporation that is outside of our nation and also after so much opposition. If we're sustaining the health of our national forest, I'm not sure why we are being so accommodating to amend our plans to, to accommodate this fossil fuel company.

Rianna Koppel: That's kind of my large comment. I'm not necessarily sure if there's a question in there, but in terms of the no action alternative that was discussed, I just want to state that I'm really concerned that it was just passed off to the side so briefly and that it seems that if we say no to this project, another project will come along.

Rianna Koppel: So why can't you say no to the project? On February 19th the Oregon department of land conservation and development denied the coastal zone management act permit. And also FERC very recently voted two to one against Jordan Cove LNG. So our state agencies have said, no action, no action, no action. And I'm just really curious why the forest service can't also say no action to this pipeline. So I realize that was a lot.

Alice Carlton: Yeah well, I listen carefully as I could. I'm not saying that I got a hundred percent of what you're asking, but the bottom line, I believe what you're asking is if I believe I can choose the no action alternative, why have I not done so?

Alice Carlton: And my answer to you is it so far with information that I have in front of me, for the responsibility of us meeting the aspects of our, the Northwest forest plan and the underlying forest plans for the three forests. Also, in consideration of our mission, all of the laws that require us not don't require but that provide the framework for the land stewardship and management that we do and considering the mineral leasing act and the energy acts that it is my belief at this

point that we can adequately meet all of the and land, the land management duties we have while amending these forest plans.

Alice Carlton: And that the larger decision FERC and others and the BLM can, will make the decisions before me about the public benefits and about and about the permitting at this point. My belief is that we can meet the conservation ethic and the and the stewardship of the public lands while making these amendments.

Alice Carlton: Now that said, the purpose of the objection process and for us listening today this afternoon is to hear whether or not, I have missed something. What is the duties of the reviewing officials to figure out whether or not I've missed something and, and for us to continue working on it and take another look to see if there is something that we need to be paying attention to and perhaps have a different decision or amend something changed something. So that's really, I think what we're doing here today.

Rianna Koppel: Yeah, no worries. I understand that. Thank you for the response. Yeah, I guess I don't have any further comments on your objection at this time. I assume you can hear my objection as being to deny the project and I really hope that the mission of the forest service itself to meet the needs of present and future generations is upheld.

Rianna Koppel: And I do not think that allocating any kind of forest plan amendments or any kind of approval from the forest service would really serve the core underlying mission of the forest service to maintain that stewardship and meet the needs of the people who live in Oregon today. I am hoping that the present generations do not include Pembina and do not include fossil fuel corporations. And yeah, that's my final comment and thank you for listening to me today and allowing us to object here.

Debbie: Thank you. Okay, thank you. Rhiannon.

Debbie: Okay, so I believe we've gotten through the list of objectors that have asked to have time on the agenda. Someone had tried to remember, it might've been George, you had Skyped or sent me an email earlier asking to figure out who was on the phone. So I was able to, I can only see who registered. But during one of our breaks I did ask our operator to identify those folks on the head of, or actually dialed in. And I can tell you that there is no one else that's dialed in that wasn't listed on the agenda. And we identified Mr. Childs from Pembina that was also listening in. So I hope George that answered your question. I can email you that information as well, but I'm only able to see who registered and so I needed to dialogue during the break with Macy to figure out who is actually on the call.

Debbie: So hopefully that helped. So next steps, what's going to happen next? As I said earlier, this call is being recorded and it is being transcribed. We will post the

audio as well as the written transcription to the Pacific connector project website. I will do that as soon as I have them in hand. That does take some time to get them. So I will do that. I'll create, it'll probably be under the supporting documents tab or I'll try to create a tab that makes it obvious where those documents are located and the audio recording. As I indicated earlier, we're already past our 45 day review date for the objection filed under 2.18 that response is due March 23rd. This morning we're talking about the 2.19 objections and objection to the fourth permanent forest plan amendment and that response is due April 21st. It is our intention to try to provide one response.

Debbie: If that's not possible, then two separate responses will be provided.

Debbie: At this point, our typical way of business to respond to objections is to send everyone a certified letter by hard copy mail. There are approximately 40 some objectors to the 2.19 amendments. We I in order to save us potentially a lot of work and people power, we don't have, I believe we're going to try to email all of you the document as soon as it's signed and I can scan that in so that you'll get it in a much more timely manner. It takes our staff a couple of days once the letter is signed to do the photocopying mailing, postage, et cetera, and it's about seven bucks a shot for a registered mail. So I'm going to ask those on the phone. If you are vehemently opposed to receiving an electronic copy, please email me and I'll make sure you get a paper copy.

Debbie: In addition, we will post the objection response to the national objection's web page, so each of your written responses will be posted to the national objection's webpage under region six, is where you can filter it by region six and that will be done about approximately one to two weeks after we send out a written response.

Debbie: Once the written response is signed and sent out, if there are any instructions, then Alice has to comply with those. For example, if there's clarification that can be made, Alex would have to comply with those. There is no timeframe with which the decision is signed after the objections process is over and so that can take any amount of time that it needs to do so. There's no tie between the end of the objections process and when the decision has to be signed with the exception that any instructions have to be complied with before any decision is signed. So as far as timelines go, I would hope that everyone would receive a copy of their written response to their 2.18 objections by the end of March. They'll be signed by the 23rd again, it just takes us some time to get them mailed out and then for the 2.19 objections April 21st but again, I'm going to try to do both at the same time.

Debbie: At this point we are almost done. There's really no additional question and answers, but if someone has a process question related to the objection responses at this time, I'm going to ask you to press pound two so that Macy can unmute your phone line. And if you do have a process question, press pound two Macy. Go ahead and unmute their phone line and ask, identify yourself and then ask your process question only.

Macy: I have none at this time. Nope, we just got one in. You may go ahead.

Francis: Hi, I'm sorry. I was just, this is Francis. I was just wondering if Susan Jane got back on, she was bumped off the call just a while back here about 15 minutes ago.

Debbie: I don't know that I wasn't aware she had bumped off.

Francis: Yeah, she was complaining. She was bumped off. Susan Jane, did you get back on?

Debbie: Sorry Susan Jane, I didn't know you had been bumped off.

Debbie: What you missed is that there will be a written and audio transcripts so you can go back and listen in on this last two and a half hours if you'd like or you can read the transcript when we post it. I will post it under the projects' webpage, which the project webpage is on the Umpqua national forest projects webpage. I can also try to send a link out to the MP3 file and the transcription to all of the eligible objectors who have sent me emails. In fact, I have all of the objectors who have sent me an email. I will send them the link so that they can access it. We do have objectors that do not have email. We've been corresponding with them in writing, so they will have to request those copies if they want them.

Debbie: If there are no other questions, I'll give one last chance for questions and otherwise we'll go ahead and wrap up and thank you George for already responding to my email or my question about hard copies and emails. I appreciate that. I'll give one last chance for somebody to raise their hand and otherwise we will complete this call. And for those of you that are both 218 and 219 eligible objectors, we will all you have to do that. You can hang up the phone once we're done and dial back in with your same access code and personal access code pin at one o'clock and we'll go through the 218 objections starting then. So Macy, do I have any other questions?

Macy: Not at this time.

Debbie: Okay. With that, I'm going to give Alice one moment to just say some concluding remarks.

Alice Carlton: Thanks Debbie. This is Alice Carlton here.

Alice Carlton: I just want to really thank people for their morning and those of you, most of you that are going to be spending your afternoon with us. And so I personally have had a lot of time in the previous rules that we had that were the appeal regulations. And now these objection rules. And I actually find that this kind of objection process actually I believe gets a set to the heart of what we're trying to do, which is really resolve people's concerns, making sure if we've overlooked something that we can back up. And sincerely take a look at that. And so I do

appreciate your time today. I know Gina appreciates it and Rita appreciates it. And Michael's here sitting right next to me, appreciate smiling and nodding his head. And so thank you.

Alice Carlton: You know, without these kinds of processes, I don't think we can do the best job that we can. And I personally understand that these projects that are, that have pieces of them that, that fall largely under laws that are beyond just the natural resource, federal agency types of laws are more complicated. They're tougher to land on and they're tougher to interact with. And who do you interact with and so for those of you that are seeking to, land here with us today, I do really appreciate your time in doing so.

Debbie: Okay Alice thank you very much for that. And again, this is Debbie Anderson and I want to thank all of the objectors who have stayed with us on this. I know that that timeframes for responding to the invitation, we're short. Thank you for your patience while I worked to get you all dial in instructions our company that is hosting this has done a great job.

Debbie: It's my unfamiliarity with the process that's been a bit of a struggle. So again, thank you all for your patience in dealing with me and trying to ensure that I get you all adequate information. Like I said, if we have to use this process again, I'll definitely do better next time. But with that we'll go ahead and conclude the call. For those of you eligible to participate in the 218 meetings, which I believe is all of you that are on the phone right now. We'll open up the phone lines again at one o'clock and we will begin the discussion related to the project level amendments at that time. So with that, hopefully everyone can take lunch and we will chat with you in about an hour and a half. So with that, thank you all very much.

PART 4 OF 11 ENDS [02:12:04]

Operator: Please stand by as I connect the lines, there will be a brief moment of silence.

Debbie Anderson: Good afternoon everyone. My name is Debbie Anderson. I'm the regional administrative review coordinator for the USDA Forest Service, region six. I would like to welcome you all to the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline forest plan amendments objection resolution meeting. The purpose of this afternoon's meeting is to address the resolution proposed for the objections that were filed under the regulation found at 36 CFR 218.

Debbie Anderson: As most of you know, we have two regulations we are addressing with this project. This morning we addressed the plan level amendments and the regulation found at 36 CFR 219. This afternoon we will focus on the project level amendments under 36 CFR 218. Those amendments apply only to this particular project. They do not apply to the life of the entire forest plan but apply only to where the proposed pipeline intersects land allocations on the Umpqua, Rogue River and Winema National Forest. Those plan amendments will only be in

effect for the life of the project. Therefore, they are reviewed under the regulation at 36 CFR 218.

Debbie Anderson: As you know, the objection filing period for the 218 plan amendments closed on January 7th, 2020. The 45 day initial review period has passed, that was on February 21st, 2020. At this point in the process, we're in the 30 day extension which is allowed by regulation and the final written response to the objections raised under the 218 regulations is to be signed no later than March 23rd, 2020.

Debbie Anderson: If you were on this morning's call, you heard us address the plan level amendments. Those responses are due on April 21st, 2020. At this time it is our intention to do one joint response for both plan level and project level amendments and to have those signed by March 23rd. I will also at the end of this teleconference address the next steps and how you will receive your written response to your objection.

Debbie Anderson: At this time I'll introduce who's in the room with the US Forest Service. I have myself again, Debbie Anderson. I have Alice Carlton who's the Responsible Official and who will be responsible for signing a final decision. Alice is the forest supervisor on the Umpqua National Forest. Listening in at home because she's slightly under the weather is our objection reviewing officer, Gina Owens. Gina is the deputy regional forester for region six Forest Service. In addition, we have Reta Laford who's here to assist Gina and we have David Krantz, the project manager.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. Hopefully those who are attending have dialed in. As you heard me say, this call is being recorded or I may not have said that. I think I put that in the notes. This call is being recorded. I will go over that in just a moment. In order to speak, you'll have to press pound two on your phone when it's your turn. Hopefully you'll do that within 15 minutes of your turn. If you have any questions while someone else is speaking, please email me and I will try to address those questions. All of you on the phone have my email and so you'll be able to just email me and I'll try to address your questions as I get them. With that, I'm going to turn it over to David Krantz who's going to go over the Forest Services' decision space and the Forest Service authorities associated with this project.

David Krantz: Good afternoon, David Krantz here. Thank you folks on the phone for taking some time out of your busy schedules to participate in today's objection resolution meetings. For those that had heard this portion in the morning. This will be just kind of a repeat of what I said, trying to explain the unique nature of the Forest Service decision space with this project. It is unique in that it's guided by certain authorities, the Mineral Leasing Act and the Natural Gas Act that put us in a cooperator role underneath two lead agencies and so I will first start out with the purpose and need of the project as explained by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, otherwise known as FERC. They are the lead agency and they lead the EIS or the Environmental Impact Statement as we are a cooperator under them. As they state in the EIS, Jordan Cove's purpose of the

project is to export natural gas through an interstate natural gas line to overseas markets by liquefying that gas at a proposed port facility known as Jordan Cove in Coos Bay.

David Krantz: The Federal Land Management agencies' rules are led by the Bureau of Land Management under the Mineral Leasing Act, specifically section 28 of that act. BLM will utilize the EIS to consider Pacific Connector's right of way application across federal lands including the national forest with concurrence from the National Forest Service and Reclamation. They will consider granting a right of way with conditions or deny the permit in part or in total. Specifically for the Forest Service, our primary purpose is to use this EIS to consider and disclose environmental consequences of construction and operating a natural gas line and evaluate the proposed land and resource plan amendments that we're here to discuss in resolution. Forest Service will look at the substantive requirements of the planning rule as they apply to the plan amendments. Forest Service is also using this EIS to identify specific stipulations otherwise known as project design features in mitigation measures related to the resources within our jurisdiction for inclusion in the right of way. Those are found in what's called the Plan of Development under appendix F10, I believe.

David Krantz: So what does all that mean in the way of a proposed action? Our consideration of plan amendments is triggered by that statutory obligation as a cooperating agency, as I said, under the Mineral Leasing Act, section 28, as well as section 313 of the Energy Policy Act. We derive specific direction out of our manual for rights of way, which is 27.20. That sets up an inner agency agreement for processing interstate natural gas pipeline proposals specifically to conduct environmental analysis of the impacts associated with construction, operation, maintenance and termination of a proposed facility, including the use of temporary areas and what's known as ancillary facilities. In this process we are requested to consider amendments or revision to our land and resource management plan if necessary to accommodate a proposed project.

David Krantz: Forest plans require amending in this instance so that the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline Project would be consistent with specific standards in the forest plans because they are worded in a manner that precludes other means to protect soil, water, riparian, rare plant and animal communities and visual resources. Forest plan standards are mandatory constraints on a project and activity and the decision making established to achieve or maintain desired future conditions or avoid and mitigate effects to meet the applicable requirements of 36 CFR 219. Those are our planning regulations.

David Krantz: Drilling down a little more specifically to what's being proposed here are 15 site specific plan amendments for the project. And as we discussed this morning two plan level land allocation adjustments. We also worked cooperatively with the FERC staff and BLM to incorporate best management practices, design features and project requirements which would avoid, minimize, reduce or eliminate environmental consequences as required by 40 CFR 1500 section. The Plan of Development is incorporated into the project description and included as

appendix F10 is also summarized in various portions of the EIS document. The nature of the decision for the Forest Service is very narrow and a limited one. The decision focuses on the project specific amendments and the matrix to late successional reserve plan amendment reallocations. As we were discussed this morning, the unique nature of those plan amendments, the project specific ones are unique to the project in that they will only take effect if the project goes forward.

David Krantz: A determination of whether the proposed amendments are directly related to what's called substantive requirements of the Forest Service planning rule are at the forefront of our analysis for our decision. Those are the substantive requirements to address sustainability, diversity of plant and animal communities, multiple use and the timber requirements. As we have laid out in our draft decision, these proposed amendments have triggered the requirement of being directly related to those substantive rule requirements and we have disclosed those effects in both the EIS and summarized in the conclusions in our draft analysis or pardon me, in our draft decision. The Responsible Official must apply those requirements within the scope and scale of the proposed amendment and if necessary, make adjustments to those proposed amendments to meet the requirements of the 36 CFR 219 planning rule.

David Krantz: In total, you will find a very voluminous appendix F that houses or has captured the Forest Service supporting documentation for the project. As FERC was leader for the EIF only summary analysis and limited information you probably found in the body of the EIF with a substantial amount of analysis and discussion within appendix F various sections, one through I believe 12, although 12 is specific to the BLM, not the Forest Service. I think the two most important documents that you will find the bulk of the work for plan specific analysis would be in F2, that is the Forest Service analysis of plan amendments and then F11 which is the draft record of decision.

David Krantz: So that concludes my overview of the Forest Service decision space. Whereas also a concept under the Mineral Leasing Act for concurrence. As I said, BLM holds the permit authority for the project and we tie into that by recommending terms and conditions for that right of way grant, but those conditions are enforceable by the Bureau of Land Management at the end of the day.

Debbie Anderson: Thank you David. Okay. If you do have questions about what David just said, you can either email me directly or you can ask those questions at the end of the resolution meeting if time permits. So I was able to do what I couldn't do last time. So those that are on the phone had asked who else was on the phone. Currently we have objectors that are listed in your agenda. Most are on the phone right now.

PART 5 OF 11 ENDS [02:45:04]

Debbie Anderson: Most are on the phone right now. We have several objectors who just wished to listen in. [inaudible 02:45:10] filed eligible objections including Barbara Powers,

Jane Heisler and Lynn Warner. Brandon Tuck is also on the phone and then we have two representatives from Pembina, Ryan Childs and David Owens. So for those on the phone... Thank you for that question, earlier. I was able to get a list at this time that could change as time goes on and people dial in when it's closer to their turn to speak. We also updated the speakers for Oregon department of fish and wildlife. Both Sarah Rief and Jay, Jesse Ratcliff are attending.

Debbie Anderson: In addition, I had two objectors that I did not reach in time that requested some time on the agenda and we have time to accommodate them. Deb McGee was added on the last version of your agenda. Toma Deavers will speak after that and then an objector I thought I had included and then took off for whatever reason because I was confused, apparently. Deb Evans is included as one of the objectors on Western Environmental Law Center's objection. So, Deb Evans will be given time to speak as well, along with the Western Environmental Law Center, Oregon Wild and Oregon Women's Lands Trust objectors. So, I apologize for any inadvertent omissions and I want to thank everyone again for their patience in working out the registration process as well as to flip to the agenda together.

Debbie Anderson: It's been a learning experience for those on the first call. This was the first time we've attempted a conference call such as this. So getting everything figured out was a process. Our normal phone lines cannot accommodate dozens and dozens of objectors and we were unsure how many people would actually attend. So with that, again, thank you David for an overview of very limited decision space that the forest service has in this type of a project. And so we will go ahead. As we were earlier, we were a little bit ahead of agenda of the agenda times, but we'll start now with our first objector. Again, focusing on resolutions related to the 218 plan amendments, at this time. We'll focus, we'll turn over the phone lines. So Lauren, if you could go ahead and open Andy stalls phone line.

Debbie Anderson: sorry we had new people on the phone. It's okay.

Alice Carlton: Thank you. Andy. This is Alice Carlton, the responsible official. I've just looked around the room and it appears that none of us have any questions to what you just said. We were able to understand pretty clearly your points, which is you know the first thing you did was just kind of recap your points from this morning that the neither plan or project level amendments are necessary because the primary policy or standard that this project could be placed off the national forest lands supersedes the fact that we would need amendments. And then your next point which is that BLM and any other agency that was legally using an instrument in order to perfect actions on National Forest System lands and including the forest services. So in concurrence activity you would see as an instrument and that therefore anyone or any instrument that is used to give permission to activities on the National Forest System lands needs to be consistent with the forest plans. You know also ESA and as well any laws, right? So did we capture your thoughts? Okay.

Alice Carlton: No, I appreciate that. I mean I do, this is Alice Carlton. I want to just say that I view that that my concurrence to the BLM for the issuance of any right-away authorization that might be issued is an extremely important step and that it is through that concurrence process that my responsibilities are played out and so I am doing what I can. I am doing everything I need to do. I believe in order to uphold those responsibilities and issue them what, if this project moves forward through that concurrence and that concurrent sounds simple. In this case, a concurrence isn't simple because it needs to include all of the measures that I see before us in order to uphold my responsibilities towards the forest plans under this action.

Debbie Anderson: So thank you, Alice.

Alice Carlton: Right here [inaudible 02:58:54]. This is Alice. I hear that Andy. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. Okay, thank you, Andy. Again though, we're well ahead. So the next set of speakers, Lauren, we'll have four lines open please. So if you could please open Susan Jane Brown, Doug Heiken, Francis Etherington and Deb Evans. So, Deb Evans you will be included in this group. Each will, each of you will be allocated 15 minutes. Since we're ahead of time, we have adequate time to do that. So you can have 15 minutes each or up to one hour as a whole. So it's up to you as with last time, it's up to you to manage your time. So Susan Jane, you are the lead objector. So I'll open it up to you speak first and you can discuss amongst the four of you who wants to go first to address the resolutions for the proposed 218 plan amendments.

Debbie Anderson: So thank you for that question, Susan Jane, this is Debbie Anderson again. So the regulatory requirement to respond to your written objections in writing is due on March 23rd so that's 75 days after the close of the objection filing period for the 218 plan amendments. So, as I know you're familiar with our objection responses. So, what you would, all objectors will receive is a cover letter signed by Gina as the reviewing officer. And then we typically do is they'll be an attachment to that letter that has a response to the objection issues that were raised. And as I stated earlier, our intent is to combine the 219 response with the 218 response. As with all responses, it's not point by point, it will be combined into themes. And so all objectors will be, will receive a signed letter with that attachment shortly after Gina signs it on the 23rd

Debbie Anderson: That's due on the 23rd

Debbie Anderson: So Susan Jane, this is Debbie again and as I probably did not fit clearly enough this morning. We're still working on this, that response. So it's a large response document and you've, I think you've outlined, let me count them, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine additional Forest Plan amendments that you all believe we should undertake. And so we're still in the process of trying to address those. As to whether the Forest Service agrees that they're needed or not

Francis Eatherington: [inaudible 03:07:03] the ATVs or the off-highway vehicles from playing on the pipeline route that once he slash piles get a burning, that pipeline is not protected. There is no ground installation effective from those slash piles burning over the pipeline. And I know the EIS said, "Oh, the ground's good insulator, no problem.". They did not analyze the impacts of the slash piles burning or tree falling over the right of way that burns and so what if it blows up? You know what happens if it blows up? We release a whole lot of methane into the air, which is the worst gas for global warming and our climate and the Forest Service had paid very little lip service to the global warming issues that you're contributing to by allowing this pipeline to Forest Service lands. And I know that the department of energy controls the class system, but nonetheless it's the Forest Service's responsibility to analyze the impacts.

Francis Eatherington: Even if you don't control that system, the Forest Service has to analyze the impacts you're forced to work with. And the EIS did not do that. The proposed amendments that you suggested were just [inaudible 00:03:08:30]... I mean, a fuel break? We know those don't work [inaudible 00:03:08:33], it just doesn't solve the problems of the wick effect and the other issues of the burning. So we... our land is only a few miles from the stouts Creek fire, which burned over the proposed route. So you know, this is absolutely a possibility that the proposed route will have a standard replacement fire over it during the life of this project.

Francis Eatherington: And we had hoped that the EIS would have addressed all the issues of wild land fire but, but I'm sorry you just, I just felt like you did not do that and really the only resolution around this is to just deny the project or do another EIS to address those impacts. I think that pretty much wraps up my feelings on the fire issue.

Deb Evans: Deb, do you mind if I go next? I feel like I'm probably the least versed on public lands but I do have a few things I'd like to say.

Francis Eatherington: Hey Deb, let me ask if they have any questions. Let me ask if they have any questions and then your next.

Deb Evans: Okay,

Debbie Anderson: Thanks. I was going to do that, Francis. So I would like to give Alice and Reta and Gina listening any anytime to ask any clarifying questions of Francis before you go next step.

Alice Carlton: This is Alice, Francis. I think you did a really good job of articulating what your thoughts were particularly around the subject of increased fire effects and the nature of how the pipeline may be buried. And how strong it will be and that your conclusion that we did not analyze enough factors to account for that or the increased fire effects and also how that's tied into methane really send a lot of those other kinds of global warming issues. So, and that also you're thinking

that the migrations that we have suggested just aren't enough and that really the only thing to do is to deny this and or issue an EIS that is more specific in its analysis and a hard, I guess I would say from your point of view of harder to look, right?

Francis Eatherington: Correct.

Alice Carlton: Okay, thanks. Reta.

Reta Laford: Oh this is Reta. No questions.

Debbie Anderson: Francis, I did... This is Debbie Anderson. I did have one question. When you started your discussion, you initially we were talking about the proposed amendments as well and you started a discussion with mitigation, which I understand, I just wanted it to be clear that you're not suggesting that we needed an additional amendment to address your concern. Is that correct? Beause I didn't see one proposed. I just want to be clear that you're not suggesting we'd be an additional amendment. We just need either better mitigation or better disclosure. Is that correct?

Francis Eatherington: Yes. You need to have better protections all around and that wasn't in the EIS.

Debbie Anderson: Okay.

Francis Eatherington: So whatever realm that comes in as mitigation or amendment, there needs to be better protections from wild land fire impacting the forest and your surrounding communities.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. I just, I did not see anything in the list of amendments that the objection proposed related to specifically to wild land fire. I have obviously we have the section where you addressed the concerns related to wild land fire risk. I just wanted to be clear that there wasn't a particular amendment that was suggested that I had missed.

Francis Eatherington: Well probably the most that you could do for this would be a supplemental EIS which we did ask for or to deny the project which we asked for. Actually, the [crosstalk 03:12:50] just deny the project, because of these terrible impacts that are so likely to happen. I would hope that you would just deny this project. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: And thank your kitty in the background, too. If that was your kitty kitty. That was cute.

Francis Eatherington: Geriatric [inaudible 00:28:11]. Yes. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. We could use a little therapy kitty, I think all the time so. All right, so if I heard right, Deb Evans, you're going next. Since I did not include your name and

organization on the agenda, my apologies greatly. If you could make sure you just introduce yourself so that we know who you are.

Deb Evans: Sure. So my name is Deb Evans and I'm an affected land owner. I also am part of a group called Hair on Fire Oregon, but I'm mostly speaking today just as an affected landowner. My husband and I owned a 157 acres of timber ground on Clover Creek Road. It's about four miles east of where a Dead Indian Memorial Road is. We bought the property in '05 as an investment and we wanted to put a home over there as a timber investment and in a month flagging went up on the property. We had no idea what it was. We had to do a little digging to figure out, we bought it from a timber company. Nobody said anything about a pipeline, so that was the beginning of this ordeal for us. You are clearly upset about that, but one of the reasons why, the reason I want to give a little bit of background is because we bought the property because it's a mile as the Crow flies from Mountain Lakes Wilderness.

Deb Evans: It's along Clover Creek Road as, I said, which has a utility free corridor that was important to us. We bought it in part, because it's near Lake of the Woods. We enjoy hiking and going up in the mountains and all the things that one does on public land and the wilderness area. Once we found out that the pipeline was proposed, we started looking into it and we've been in this fight for coming up on 15 years now. We, my concerns are similar to Francis's, it is an investment for us. It is a timber piece of property. Fire is probably our number one concern that already we feel like with increased heat and lower moisture content that our timber is already struggling and that you introduce something like a pipeline with natural gas at high pressure with the [inaudible 03:15:29] class one pipe and all of a sudden you've brought in incrementally risk that we did not have or do not have currently.

Deb Evans: So that's a great concern to us. I think there were things in the FDIs that concerned us. There were statements made that they picked Clover Creek Road to go along a current right away, but I can tell you that on our property, this does not go along the road. It goes inside of our property, so it comes straight off of Winema National Forest, old growth onto our property goes almost a half a mile across our property and then back onto old growth Winema National Forest. Again, we picked this property in large part, because it had access to Clover Creek Road and it was surrounded by old growth Winema National Forest. When you put a 95 foot swath cut, a 95 foot swath through that. So I just want to make a couple of comments on all the, I've got to look at my notes, the visual quality objectives for us that's devastating, right?

Deb Evans: You're talking about taking public lands, allowing this pipeline to go through in an area that traditionally has never had things like that. And in fact it is deemed the utility free corridor and that is a concern to us. So that visual, not just from Clover Creek or Dead Indian Memorial Road, but when you're up in the mountains up on Mountain Lakes Wilderness, what you will see from there as it [inaudible 03:17:01] to us. I think the other concerns we've already touched on

a little bit, fire concern is probably one of our largest concerns. Another one we have were organic produce growers where we live, which is in Jackson County.

Deb Evans: We live up on the Green Springs, which is an area similar. We watch the Oregon Gulch Fire come through six miles from our home. And so the idea that this could be a firebreak, which I've heard somebody talk about... I'm also a volunteer firefighter for the [inaudible 03:17:35] Fire and Rescue. And I can say that there's watching the Oregon Gulch Fire and our new climate situations in the summer, that fire jumped 10,000 acres a day. It, the sparks coming off of the fire were going a half a mile in front of the fire. There's no way that a 95 foot swath is going to stop anything in Southern Oregon. So, just want to put that out there and

PART 6 OF 11 ENDS [03:18:04]

Deb Evans: in Oregon. So, just want to put that out there. And I'm trying to think if there are other... So, going back up for a second on the visual quality objectives. Yeah, it's my understanding that even in the FEIS you... you know it says right in there that re-vegetation could take as long as 20 to 30 years. Now, that's going to be past my lifetime. That's for sure. And I guess from our standpoint again that danger that you're introducing, and to not just the public lands which is bad enough, that affect everybody along the route of the pipeline. Those are concerns that we have as well.

Deb Evans: That's probably getting close. Let me see if... Now I want to mention [crosstalk 03:18:49]

Susan Jane Brown: Pacific trail. You're close to the Pacific Crest Trail.

Deb Evans: We're quite near the Pacific Crest Trail. And, ironically, where we live in Jackson County the trail comes right through our property. The Pacific Crest Trail is an easement on our current property. So, we know a lot about the trail. We hike a lot on the trail/ Almost every day we're on the trail. And where it's going to cross, I know it's been moved from where it was originally proposed, but I have real concerns about what that means for a national scenic trail to have this pipeline come through. And it's not clear to me from the way the FEIS is written of whether the bore is going to happen or not happen there in one place. It suggests that it will happen in another place. It's not... It says... It doesn't mention that at all.

Deb Evans: So, I'm curious about that. I'm concerned about that. I think that it absolutely needs to happen and that the old growth that typically is around that area, where the trail goes through, that it shouldn't be disturbed at all. That trail should... The pipeline shouldn't be anywhere near the trail, number one, and if it's going to have to go onto the trail then it should go with a bore that sets it far... the clear-cut far back from the trail. And I guess... Let's see. I think... So,

one question, is there going to be a bore or is there not. And if you just hold onto that thought, I'm going to try to wrap up my comments.

Deb Evans: I think we've felt all along we've done extensive research on this company, on what their intent is with this project. You mentioned the mining lease act. And I guess I have questions about... If this is Canadian gas with a Canadian... being proposed with a Canadian company going through public land that is US public land, is there an obligation to provide that pipeline to get Canadian gas out? And I believe strongly that that is relevant to this conversation. It's something that I haven't heard a lot of people talking about. We've raised the issue and the FERC docket docket, so you should be familiar with it. But, it's something that really... If you're looking at public interest, we believe that you need to look at those issues and decide truly whether an action... an amendment change is what is needed or if the no action alternative was what was needed all along. I think 15 years... In the entire 15 years that we've been fighting this project, there has never been one binding contract for the LNG off-take.

Deb Evans: So again, is it speculation that this is being done on or is there actually a market out there that would buy US gas off of the West coast? And I think that has not been determined. And that is of a concern to us. That our public lands that are used by US citizens are getting turned into something for the government of Canada to benefit from. And I would like to see the evidence looked at, at least by the National Forest Service, to say whether this is a legitimate use or these amendments are even needed in this case. I think that pretty much concludes my comments. So, I have the questions around whether a bore will happen underneath the Pacific Crest Trail according to your current plan. And whether a no action alternative is justified or the leasing mining act even comes into play if we're talking about another country's natural gas.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. Thank you Deb. I think David can address the borehole at this... Borehole, sorry. The boring, not boring but boring, underground... Under... David, take it over. I'm done talking.

David Krantz: It will create a hole underground.

David Krantz: Yeah. My name is David Krantz. And I worked with the company to look at a strategy to reduce effects at the crossing. Based on internal and external comments from our own staff is what I mean by there, to reduce the impacts to old growth stands and visual quality objective in for recreational users. Especially because that area has that unique Pederson Sno-Park there. And there's a small... A shelter along that trail corridor and it is a unique little resource there. So, we worked with the company to find a route that would remove tax to that corridor. Therefore, get users that use that small public use cabin. So, what we came up with was a bore design to maintain the visual quality objectives along that trail corridor. By co-locating first with the roadway and then boring under the roadway and leaving the natural old-growth stand on each side of the road, so that it would create natural screening there.

David Krantz: So, the setbacks for the bore, off the top of my head, I believe is between 200 and 300 feet back on each side. And that was based on technical feasibility provided by both the applicant and FERC on how far they can do these directional boards given the geology and the site. So, that's what we have as the preferred alternative at this site or incorporated into the proposed action. The company included that in their FERC filings. So, you saw a change in the alternatives from draft to final incorporating that into the proposed action. So, that's why it's probably a little confusing and we'll be happy to clarify that in the record of decision. And those are terms and conditions that will be incorporated in that concurrence process back to the Bureau of Land Management, should it go forward. Yes. Thank you very much.

Debbie Anderson: So, Deb. Just to... This is Debbie Anderson again. So, that actually was a question we had upon review. So, just as an example of how the objection process works and the review process works, it was unclear to the reviewing team whether or not that borehole was included in the final design of the proposed action. So, we had already identified that during the review process, that we would need to clarify that in the final decision. So, thank you for raising it in front of all of the other objectors, but that is something that we have already discussed would need to be clarified because it wasn't entirely clear that that was happening. So...

David Krantz: As an unintended benefit of the bore design, we end up co-locating a portion of the right of way, about a mile of it, with existing roads out on the landscape as well. So, we incorporate in more disturbed areas as well as preserve the integrity of the trail at the crossing location. We are all ears right now, if you have another resolution point to cross that trail that would impact it less. I guess that's why we're here, to understand if there is other opportunities or ways to resolve the crossing. The trail goes, as we know, North and South and the pipelines goes East and West, so invariably at some point that you cross.

David Krantz: So, we were handed, or dealt, an unfavorable hand here. We did look at routes off National Forest System lands, to the south, that put it in the expanded Siskiyou National Monument and so that was not a viable option. As well as spotted frog habitat to the south and into the north, you run into recreation areas like Lake of the woods. Further north you run into Sky Lakes wilderness. So, we kind of had a pinch point here and we're trying to sort out the best location, given the resource value concerns north and south of this location.

Alice Carlton: Thanks Dave. And then Dave... This is Alice Carlton. Dave, could you address the question that Ms. Evans raised, which is should this project be... Does it actually lawfully fall underneath the mineral leasing act because of the fact that it's a foreign company with potentially foreign gas?

David Krantz: So, it's hard for me to speak on that because it's really BLM jurisdiction to answer that question. And I don't want to undermine their jurisdiction and their responsibilities to prove up this question, on one way or the other. So, it's... Yes.

We are all curious about that as well, but we have to stay within our jurisdictional box if you will for that portion of it.

Deb Evans: So, can I just-

Francis Eatherington: And then [crosstalk 03:27:59] again.

Deb Evans: Can I just make the follow up-

Francis Eatherington: [crosstalk 03:28:03]

Alice Carlton: Yes, please go ahead.

Deb Evans: So, I understand that FERC is the lead agency. I understand that they need to probably make a decision first, but do you have jurisdiction as a National Forest Service to come up with a different conclusion? In other words, I know you're a cooperating agency, but can your public interest determination be different from FERC's, when it comes to either approving right away for the company or not?

David Krantz: Well, I think the most important question is, Alice has full authority on the plan amendments. That's within our jurisdiction 100% as we discussed earlier today. So, that's what we're here to discuss, the plan amendments and our decision space for the project. BLM is issuing the permit for the right of way grant, that's the question you have to ask them on public interest and their determination as well as federal energy regulatory commission. Because those are the two primary lead agencies for jurisdiction to permit the project. But you full authority on plan amendments. And so I'll let Alex speak more on that.

Alice Carlton: Oh that's... That sums it up. I was just going to say that it's the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that really defines whether or not this project's in the public benefit. And the question that I hear you ask about whether or not the project ought to go forward, since it's from a foreign company and potentially then foreign gas to be exported to foreign countries. It's really in the jurisdiction and the realm of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission who works with the Department of Energy underneath a whole... a whole different set of laws than we normally do just for the... to steward the public lands. So, that's the best that I could answer that question.

Deb Evans: Okay. And just to clarify, it's less about the fact that it's a foreign company. It's all about the fact that they're shipping gas that isn't even coming from the US.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. Thank you for that. And we've jotted that down. And I'll go back and see if that was raised in the objection, to make sure that we cover that point if it was.

Debbie Anderson: And Deb, I know... Ms. Evans, I know you weren't on that earlier call. We did have discussion earlier about objection issues that were raised that are outside

of the forest services jurisdiction. And so, if it is something that isn't in jurisdiction and we have no legal obligation to disclose it or discuss it, we won't be addressing it in our objection response. So, I wanted to make that clear to the objectors who joined this afternoon. So, for example, we had a question on impacts to murrelets. And the pipeline doesn't cross National Forest System land where we have marbled murrelets. And so, an objection issue related to that won't be addressed in a final response. So, that's just an example of something we won't address. So, if our research shows that truly the forest service doesn't have any discretion with that, then that won't be an objection issue that we can respond to.

Deb Evans: And I think I have just one.

Debbie Anderson: [crosstalk 03:31:31]. Oh, okay.

Deb Evans: Alrighty.

Debbie Anderson: Yep. Go on.

Deb Evans: Just one quick follow up. As far as routes, David, I think you suggested that may be you're still open to comments about the crossing under the Pacific Crest Trail. Is that true about... Are you open to having, for instance on our property, having that pipeline route go... stay right along Clover Creek road versus what it's doing currently, which is not staying right along Clover Creek road?

David Krantz: Well, I guess my point being that if there's plan amendments being challenged with the project and a resolution point would be avoiding that plan amendment by a alternate route and then it could be a win win for your property as well, then that would be important to bring that to light during this process. Because really we're all here today to look for ways to resolve your objection. And so we resolve that by the objectors proposing a solution that would remove that issue from consideration today. Now, bringing forward a new alternative at this point would be difficult because you're supposed to do that during the process of EIF. So, while Burke is the lead on that, on the EIS, they probably are going to have concerns on bringing in new information post-EIS.

Deb Evans: Got it. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. I thought I heard Francis asks an additional question. If not, we'll go to Doug. So, Francis did you have something? I thought I heard you jumping in but I could be wrong.

Francis Eatherington: No, I... Maybe this is off the subject. About that marbled murrelets and spotted owls on the Blue Ridge alternative. It's right between the Siuslaw National Forest and the Siskiyou National Forest. And those [inaudible 03:33:39] owls go onto the National Forest Lands. So, I don't know how you could say it's not a national forest issue. Just wanted to throw that out there

Debbie Anderson: And we'll be looking at that Francis in our objection responses, if it should have been addressed.

Francis Eatherington: Okay, thank you.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. And for the remainder of the time we have for this section, Doug Heiken, if you're still on.

David Krantz: So, Doug, the regulations are in BLM's 40 CFR section. And that's where it's defined as a concurrence process. 43 CFR, pardon me. I was getting a stern look from Debbie Anderson.

Debbie Anderson: Wait, 40 43. Okay. Thank you.

David Krantz: And so, yes, in our handbooks there's direction on how we interact with them. And it's really through the EIS process, in the plan of development sections where we recommend ways to avoid, minimize, mitigate impacts the National Forest System lands and resources. So, that's the essence of what we're doing in the EIS. It's not a consultation process as much as a interagency agreement that we work under, as I described at the beginning of this discussion, for the forest service and the BLM to be co-operators under FERC. FERC works under the natural gas act for the certificate of the line. And it's BLM that is the lead for the mineral leasing act. Because this project, as Andy still mentioned, crosses multiple federal land management agencies. So, that triggers the transfer of the permitting authority to Bureau of Land Management. And Andy summed that up really well, with his point being that it was to reduce the amount of redundancy of permits needed for a project. And so that an applicant only has one application and one permit at the end of the day versus three or four, depending on how many land management agencies it crosses.

David Krantz: So, in the 20... whatever I mentioned at the top of the hour, the handbook reference where you can go in the forest service manual and see the nuts and bolts of how we interact. With myself being designated as a project manager with BLM. And I'm working on those plan development sections. That's our concurrence process.

Alice Carlton: This is Alice. I just want to make sure that we've answered your question in terms of what's the scope of our responsibility and authority and clarified that, from discussions we had earlier today.

Alice Carlton: Okay. Well we're here if you want to...

Debbie Anderson: [crosstalk 00:21:44].

Alice Carlton: [crosstalk 03:39:44].

Debbie Anderson: Yeah. Doug, this is Debbie Anderson. This is... If you... If we're not being clear, this is our opportunity to come together to talk about it. We have limited time left in the 218 review. So, if we're not being clear, can you help us understand what you need to make it more clear. Do we need to better define the forest services roles and responsibilities? Do we need a better explanation in the record of decision? Do we need a table that outlines all of those authorities? I just want to be... I want to make sure we have this dialogue now because if we're not going to give you something that helps understand it, then we're not being successful either.

Alice Carlton: Yeah. Good. Thank you, Debbie.

Doug Heiken: There can be a lamb and their hands are tied. So. It's complicated. And it's not the answer I want to hear, but that's what I'm hearing.

David Krantz: Appreciate your concerns. I hear you. I know it's difficult and awkward. This process is tough on us all to understand. And we have to work within our regulatory framework. And I know that that doesn't provide you a lot of solace when I say that. Only thing I can say is when it comes to the permit, BLM at the end of the day holds card. We simply have a concurrence process. And one thing you mentioned was, how do you reconcile. And it gets elevated to the secretaries. For instance, if we put something in a concurrence with terms and conditions for the plan and development, that's Alice. Alice writes the letter and BLM pushes back and says, "No, we're not going to incorporate X or Y project design feature." And then we hold back our concurrence, it would get elevated. And there's not a very defined process in the 43 CFR, but it essentially goes to the respective secretaries to then sit down and sort that out.

David Krantz: Ultimately, at the end of the day, the way that I've heard this to go down is BLM can still issue the right of way grant without for service concurrence. And that's the place where we don't want to be. We want to have as much influence on that concurrence process as possible so that we have the best outcomes should this project go forward with terms and conditions, to protect NFF lands and resources. What I've heard of the backdrop is that the secretary of interior can issue it just so long as it doesn't conflict with the primary purpose for which that reserve was established. So, going back to the enabling legislation of specific reserves. And that's much narrower is my interpretation. And this is me personally right now, much narrower than the IFMA having the full soup to nuts underneath our forest plans.

David Krantz: So, we're trying to hold as much as we can. The feet to the fire, if you will, with BLM. And incorporate in a robust package of terms and conditions. And again, we're here to listen and respect your concerns and try to incorporate anything in that you feel we got wrong. And I know you guys say we got a lot wrong. Okay, well we'll try our best. And that's for Alison Gina to push it back down to me on what they want to see at the end of the day incorporated in.

Alice Carlton: Thank you, Dave. This is Alice again. Doug, I just want to make sure that we paint the picture, what I consider to be accurately. Which is we are working well with the BLM, the Department of Interior. And so I don't... What I want to do is have you understand that that process is actually going well. And I don't have any reason at this point to have concern or doubt that that there would be any friction or problems with all of the things that we've identified in the EIF, as mitigation to help support these plan amendments, would have a problem getting through into a permit if this decision is made to go forward to the project. So, I just want to be really clear about that.

Doug Heiken: That sounds nice that you're finding agreement but I'm concerned that you're not necessarily standing up to the public interest as much as you should be. Rather you're being a team player is more important. So, that concerns me.

Alice Carlton: Right. I hear your concern. I just want you to know I register your concern and hear that, you know?

Debbie Anderson: Okay. So, this is Debbie again. Circling back to the time that we have allocated between Susan Jane, Doug, Francis and Deb Evans. There's still time left on the clock. So, I'll circle back one more time and we'll just go back through our lists. So Susan Jane, did you have anything else that you wanted to capture before we move on to the next person?

David Krantz: The Department of Interior, the secretary perhaps can. I don't think BLM can but the secretary's office at that level would have ultimate reporting under the mineral leasing act. Because we don't have a decision with the concurrence. It's just concurrence. It is what it is. So, it's a recommendation of the forest service on the terms and conditions we'd like to see in that right of way grant. So, that's where the rub is. But, it would be the secretary of interior and the secretary of agriculture negotiating out those terms and conditions, should the BLM and the forest service unable to reconcile it.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. Thank you. I'll go back to... Let's see. Francis, did you have any other additional questions?

Francis Eatherinton: You know, I did have an additional questions about the boring under the trail. And it was not analyzed in the FEIS under the alternative description, you know on page 3-49. So, if it wasn't discussed in the alternative description, can you... Is it... Can you just throw it in there? At the appeal resolution phase?

David Krantz: Yeah, it was... it was disclosed in the draft EIF, in the alternative section. And then it was incorporated in the proposed action, in the final. And then the other alignment was flipped. It would have been put into the alternative section as the non-preferred alternative. So, if you look under the alternative section of the final EIS, what you would see was the old proposal. The one that required plan amendments. That one that went through the old [inaudible 00:30:08].

David Krantz: But, what you will find in chapter four would be that boring design incorporated into the proposed action. No longer an alternative. And that's just for format. And quite frankly it was... It's kind of clunky. And it confuses the public. And we've criticized them, along with all co-operating agencies, that we don't like the way they do alternatives versus effects analysis in chapter four. But they are the ones that are leading the process. So, they find it to be sufficient and we have to live with it at the end of the day as to how it's packaged, the EIF.

Alice Carlton: The bottom line, Francis, is you may not see it in that particular section of chapter three, but it is incorporated into chapter.

David Krantz: In the final EIS.

Francis Eatherington: Okay. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. And then... Let's see. Deb, did you have anything left? Any last questions?

Deb Evans: I have... Yeah. I have one question, I do. I don't know if it's to this audience, but I'm going to ask it anyway and maybe you can tell me. I have concerns over routing and the FEIS was not at all clear to me. Well, I thought it was clear to me until somebody pointed out that maybe it wasn't. So, I was under the impression that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is advocating for the Blue Ridge variation route. And that... I know your Federal Forest Service isn't on that route, I guess, but BLM is. And I guess the question is, if these changes of amendments for the forest service and the districts that are getting created, or want to be created by the BLM, are they for that... just that route? The Blue Ridge variation route? Or are they interchangeable? Or... It's just sort of vague in my mind of how it was written. And I just wondered if any of you can shed any clarity on, are we talking about one route or are we still... Is it up in the air of what route we're talking about?

Debbie Anderson: So, this is Debbie Anderson. That's a good question. At this time we, the Forest Service, don't have knowledge of what the BLM is going to choose to do. They're still, I think, doing some internal analysis on that. So, it has not been made public. So, we don't have an answer as to that Blue Ridge variation and what might happen. So, apologize we can't help you more there but we don't have that information.

Deb Evans: But the FEIS does say the Blue edge variation route, correct? And we're under the right assumption that that is what everybody is look.

PART 7 OF 11 ENDS [03:51:04]

Deb: And we're under the right assumption that, that is what everybody is looking at?

David Krantz: Honestly, you really have to call the Bureau of Land Management and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission because that alignment is on private and

BLM land exclusively, and is quite a few miles away from the Umpqua National Forest. So it does not touch and concern us, and I haven't followed it very closely. I know it's been complicated and it hurts my head like it hurts you folks' head. So I don't [crosstalk 00:00:33].

Deb: It is near national forest land. It is very close to the Siuslaw and Siskiyou National Forest. So it is near national-

David Krantz: Okay, understandable, but there's no jurisdiction on those two national forests because it doesn't cross those two national forests. While those are adjacent, if there are effects to those forests, which we have worked collaboratively with the Siuslaw to identify concerns and resource issues of indirect effects that FERC needed to incorporate into their EIS. If they did not, it's to their peril. It's not a forest service jurisdiction issue with plan amendments because they don't cross those forests. They're just indirect effects. But we have advocated for FERC to disclose impacts to at least the Siuslaw. I have not heard anything come in from the Siskiyou. But again, it's at FERC's peril if they did not do it correctly.

Alice Carlton: And remember that he was part of the [River Siskiyou 00:01:31] administratively at this point. And so we haven't heard anything. And so, and my point there, this is Alice, is that they'd been involved in the project [inaudible 03:52:41] all along. [crosstalk 03:52:43]

David Krantz: Yes.

Alice Carlton: Yeah. [crosstalk 03:52:48] So this is Alice. I Understand that that may not be as satisfactory of answer as you would like from us, but it's the best. And we don't want to mislead you saying anything that may not be true because it really lies within those two agencies and frankly it's kind of gone back and forth. So I don't hope for this.

Deb Evans: Oh, that makes sense to me. Except for, I just assumed maybe wrongly that the FEIS says the Blue Ridge Variation route, but you're telling me that it's still up in the air.

David Krantz: Again I didn't read that portion of the EIS because I was trying to limit my exposure to migraines. I know that the wording is confusing in itself because they call one a Blue Ridge Variation and another the Blue Ridge Alternative or something like that. So it is clear as mud on how they work through those two. I know one's low land in one Upland and one has more effects on BLM lands and resources and the other has more effects to private land and aquatic resources. I do not know which one [crosstalk 03:53:52] preferred and I do not know which one the BLM is recommending.

Alice Carlton: [crosstalk 03:53:59] Well I am very clear with it and I can tell you that the Blue Ridge is the Blue Ridge route is the Blue Ridge and the Blue Ridge variation is the low land and the condition that is part of the FEIS that staff recommended

was the Blue Ridge Variation route. That's clear. But what's not clear, and I believe the BLM says in the FEIS that they concur with the staff at FERC that their preferred route is the Blue Ridge Variation because it is significantly less environmentally damaging. So I would, I mean I'm under the assumption that's where we're headed is that direction. Not the other direction, but I'm just kind of curious to hear your reactions now are making me question whether it's set in stone or whether there is still negotiations going on about that.

David Krantz: Sounds like you know more than we do? [crosstalk 03:54:57]

Debbie Anderson: Yeah, so this is Debbie Anderson. I understand your questions Deb and I understand your concerns but we are focused here on the, on Alice's decision of the forest plan amendments and neither of those, the route or the variation crosses national forest system lands and we understand Francis is concerned about the indirect effects to the adjacent national forest system lands. So I have no ability at this moment to get you that answer and nobody at this table does as far as your question so.

Deb Evans: Now that's fine. [crosstalk 03:55:28].

Debbie Anderson: I know that doesn't satisfy you but I, at this point we are focused just on Alice's decision space.

David Krantz: Only thing I can do Deb is I will gladly give you the project manager for the BLM and you can call him directly.

Deb Evans: That would be great. I would love to talk to him.

David Krantz: Okay. [crosstalk 03:55:50]

Debbie Anderson: I will make sure that David gets your email.

Deb Evans: That'd be perfect. Thank you so much. Really appreciate it.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. And then, let's see, I think Doug you went last. I've lost track now. So Doug, did you have anything left?

Doug Heiken: Nothing further. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. Okay. With that, let me check my time here. We are doing great. All right, so in the interest of everyone's sanity, we are a little ahead of time. So as we did this morning, I'm going to ask Lauren to mute all phones. We're going to take a quick five minute restroom break. We are going to take a little more than five minutes here. So there is not that many areas we can go. So by my, let's see, by my phone, it is 2:26 so we'll resume with George Sexton and Rhodia [Mentors 03:56:55] . We will resume at 2:35 with them. So we've got about a nine minute break. I hope that is okay with everyone, but I know we in this room need it. So

the rest of you do as also, so Lauren, if you can please mute all lines. We will be back in nine minutes.

Debbie Anderson: All right, so sorry for a little bit of delay. It's time to start again. So let's see. Lauren, you're still with us, so if you can go ahead and unmute. Let's see. George Sexton and [Brodia 04:12:32] [Mentors 03:58:50] lines. I will welcome them and we'll get started with them.

Debbie Anderson: All right. We have George with us but not [Brodia 04:12:42].

Debbie Anderson: Okay. You're in the same room together. Okay.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. We didn't see a separate line for you. Okay.

Debbie Anderson: Okay, so it is, you're in now. You guys' time to start talking.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. Does [Brodia 04:11:52] want to weigh in at this point?

Debbie Anderson: Are you talking about consultation with the services?

Alice Carlton: This is Alice. [Brodia 04:14:29] could you restate your question for me? I'm not sure I quite grasped it.

Alice Carlton: All right. I know I didn't.

David Krantz: It's in the cumulative impact section. There's there's a separate section in the chapter four that focuses on cumulative effects. And so that section is looking at the project impacts that are associated with the plan amendments because there's no effect by the plan amendment itself. It's the project that's making the on the ground impact. So where we have a stream crossing you will see within that watershed a cumulative effects discussion touching and concerning crossing that watershed for instance, and what that means in the way of reasonably foreseeable future projects and past and present projects. So it is by resource.

David Krantz: There are tables within the appendices associated with the plan amendments. I think what you referring to is the compensatory management or mitigation plan that is specific to restoration actions for the residual effects of the pipeline. And there are tables within that appendix that describe both the short term detrimental effects and the long term benefits to those resources. So, we do a both a temporal and spatial scale of those effects. And it's also included in the consultation for the project, both with new fisheries and fish wildlife service as well as included in that cumulative effects discussion as I mentioned earlier. Which is I think the last section in the EIS and I don't know the number off the top of my head.

Debbie Anderson: You mean if they would have occurred without the project moving forward.

Alice: So if the project doesn't...

Brodia Minter: And the answer to that in short is no.

David Krantz: They would not. They would...

David Krantz: So the question is no, those projects would not occur without this project going forward. I guess to the first part and then the second part of my clarification back to you is that we did come up with specific discreet projects and they are included in the administrative record and I know it's voluminous and I hear you, it's hard to tease out this stuff, but we did the leg work to go out and identify specific units and created specific projects. We even have all the GPS locations, a site by site and the parameters of what we're looking for so that we can put that forward in the right of way grant to bind the applicant so that if they get a notice to proceed, they must do this quality of work in order to get a notice to proceed.

David Krantz: And the part that we didn't tease out and we did it in a programmatic fashion here was because of the voluminous nature of this EIS, we wouldn't feel like the public would have a meaningful input on each one of those discrete projects. And we wanted to give the public an opportunity to help be more informed and look at the larger picture and perhaps even batch some of the work that would be done for the Pacific connector project.

David Krantz: There may be other restoration projects in those watersheds and we would look at bringing those all together in a single new effort under certain resource value benefits. So I guess the short answer is it's a programmatic fashion, but we provided the nuts and bolts in detail on each one of the projects and the type of projects that we do so that if we needed a replacement project for instance, because the fire came through and burned down a stand and we could no longer go in there and do non-commercial thinning for enhancement of late successional forest, we would pick another unit that is in kind and close in proximity and we could then say to Pembina, here are the parameters that we had for that other project and it was burned up in a fire, but we want you to [inaudible 04:21:32] now treat this stand in an adjacent area.

David Krantz: So we wanted to have enough specificity that we would have a quantifiable amount of acres or miles of stream restoration or miles road decommissioning, et cetera, that we could then hold the company to later on. And it was also on...

David Krantz: Go ahead. [inaudible after that]

David Krantz: Clarify that. What would we be doing is tearing off from this EIS for step-down NEPA. It would likely be an EA or CE depending on the restoration project that we would be going out with. So we have certain authority for fuels and fire reduction under CE category for some of those projects would fit under those. In other instances we're doing non-commercial thinning, mechanical thinning.

We'd probably use EA as the correct vehicle. So we would look at different ways to do step down NEPA to implement those projects. And so it's akin to how you do a LRMP to kind of set the programmatic sideboards in any EIF and then you will do implementation projects under that plan to get to your desired future conditions. And this is a similar type of strategy where we're trying to get desired future conditions in adjacent stand to qualities affected by the project because of the residual effects of that long term right of way corridor. [inaudible after that].

Debbie Anderson: So this is Debbie. I'm going to do my facilitation job. I'm going to let you wrap up in the last minute that you have and then we have to move on to our next speaker to honor the timeline. So if you have a closing statement you'd like to make you or George, you can do that in this last minute. [inaudible after that].

PART 8 OF 11 ENDS [04:24:04]

Alice Carlton: Thank you very much, both of you.

Debbie Anderson: Okay, so let's see. I'm not sure if we've switched now to our next operator if it's Lauren or [Oneda 04:40:27] that is on, but if you will switch on the phone line to Sarah Rice and Jesse Ratcliffe. It is now their time to discuss the Project Level Amendment Resolution.

Operator: All right I see Sarah's line but not Jesse.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. They may be in the same room together so... Thank you.

[inaudible]

Alice Carlton: I'm Jesse, this is Alice. I want to take a crack at this. I want to be really clear about this, that it's my belief at this point, for the work that we've done, that the project as described in the FEIS and is reflected in the draft Final Impact Environmental Impact Statement allows me to make a decision that is consistent with the forest planning laws with our forest plans including the Northwest Forest Plan and which are also within other laws that regulate me as a decision maker.

Alice Carlton: And so I want to just be very clear that I believe that at this point that I've presented to Gina is an analysis that is complete and has this remaining hole in terms of our stewardship and management or leadership responsibilities [inaudible 04:28:34] national forest. And I fully am given with my interactions with our sister agency in the department of interior, the BLM, that they will accept and uphold the mitigation plans that are a part of that EIS and FEIS of the [inaudible 04:29:01] and that they will incorporate those into any authorization should this project be perfected. And so let me state the antithesis of that too. I have no expectation that this will need to go any further beyond the decision

makers at this level, which would be the state director for the Bureau of Land Management.

Alice Carlton: In the Pacific Northwest and myself. Obviously, understanding that Gina may, based on her reviewing of this, may have some direction for me and based on what we've heard today may have some direction for me. We will continue to look at all the comments that have been made and I want to make sure that if it looks like there is any holes or something that's missing that we'll look at what needs to be done no matter what it takes to correct those. We will do what needs to be done. I wanted to just make sure that you heard from me where I think we are in the process, what my decision space is, how I see this unfolding and what my interactions have been with other agencies that I have to work in tandem with regarding my responsibilities under this project. So I'm going to leave that there and then ask you for other questions that I may have just elicited by my statement or other questions that you have in general.

Debbie Anderson: Okay Okay

Alice Carlton: Right. So I was trying to imagine what questions you would ask where I would tell you I won't answer that rather than I can't answer that. And you may have done it. What I want to do here is, I think it's important for us to focus on what's in front of us, not what could happen or theoretically might happen from here on out. And so that's why I want to just go back to that, at this point, I'm working with the obligations and responsibilities and authorities that I have. And that I think is really important for us to spend our time on today.

Alice Carlton: And in addition to that, I want you to know that it's from every interaction I've had on this project now, not been as long as some of you, it's only been about eight and a half years, not been longer than that, but it's been eight and a half years. And so we've gone through a lot of phases together on that. And so it's my best belief that there is not a quagmire of misunderstanding or intrigue or anything like that between the Bureau of Land Management who we work with on this project. So that's the best I can answer you for now.

Alice: Thanks Jesse. This is Alice. May I just make a remark? I also value our relationship and anything that is within the realm of the work we've done and my judgment of that, that we are meeting our stewardship responsibilities underneath the suite of laws that I have to work under. I'm happy to work with you, continue to work with you on those topics. Okay. Thanks.

Debbie Anderson: [inaudible 04:36:07] I was just going to let you know that I have about, timer's counting down, about four and a half minutes.

Sarah Reif: Potential gaps there, not only for the owl but also for listed fish and other aquatic wildlife in the riparian areas for big game habitat, fisher and for migratory birds. Same goes as it relates to erosion risks, sedimentation risks in the streams and the impacts of the fish habitat. We again would be more than

happy to work with the forest service to more clearly articulate that risk and try and improve your project design and mitigation features to better offset those impacts. I think I'll leave it there just with the open invitation for us to continue working together to try and resolve those concerns and issues.

Alice Carlton: Thank you. I think that, I think we certainly understand your concerns. I really appreciate you actually helping me to understand a little bit more than we could do this morning regarding the NSO habitat and those concerns. And so that was really helpful for me and the continued invitation that we can certainly look at this crosswalk together. So thank you for that, Sarah.

Sarah: Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: Okay, so I'll go back. This is Debbie again. I'll go back to our operator. It's probably Oneda by now. If you can activate Denise Tschann's phone line. Denise, you have the microphone if you're still on. So operator...

Operator: yes, I apologize.

Debbie Anderson: Are you there? Yeah. Denise Tschann. T-S-C-H-A-N-N.

Toma Deavers: Hello.

Debbie Anderson: Hello.

Operator: Perfect. And Denise Tshaun's line is unmuted.

Debbie Anderson: Thank you, Denise. Go ahead.

Operator: Denise please ensure your line's not muted on your end

Debbie Anderson: Did hear her say hello.

Toma Deavers: This is Toma Deavers.

Debbie Anderson: Hello? Toma.

Toma Deavers: Yeah. Hello

Debbie Anderson: We were looking for Denise. Hello? We were looking for Denise.

Operator: Once again, Denise, your line is unmuted. Please go ahead.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. We may not have Denise.

Operator: We are slightly ahead of schedule.

Debbie Anderson: Slightly ahead of schedule, so yes. [crosstalk 04:42:21] Well, yeah. Well it's actually, she's exactly on time. I can send Denise an email, so if you can mute all the rest of the lines and we'll move on to our next objector. Melanie Plaut P-L-A-U-T and I will email Denise to see if she is going to rejoin us. She may have ran out of time.

Melanie Plaut: Yeah. Hi, this is Melanie. Are you ready for me to speak?

Debbie Anderson: Yes, Melanie. Thank you.

Melanie Plaut: Yeah. Can you hear me okay?

Debbie Anderson: Yes, you're loud and clear.

Melanie Plaut: Okay, good. So I'm Melanie Plaut. I'm a physician in the practice of obstetrics and gynecology. So I am not an expert on forest policy and I'm not a lawyer, but I have been involved in the past with federal regulation because one of the jobs I've done as a physician is to chair the Institutional Review Board, which look at the ethics of human subjects research. And this is a highly federally regulated arena. For instance, if we're trying to develop a new vaccine for COVID-19, for this new Corona virus, an IRB who would have to decide the rules of the testing to be sure that the vaccine was safe and effective. It's one of the most highly regulated federal activities that exists today. So in my experience with those federal regulations, I realized that there is often a lot of gray area.

Melanie Plaut: I've been able to listen off and on to the conversation this afternoon and I've heard some discussion, shall we say, about how broad the authority for the forest service is in this situation, how much they have to defer to BLM, to FERC, or how much they can stand up and say what they really believe. And I just want to urge you, as the forest service, to really take a broad and not a narrow view whenever you have an option. And to stand up for us, who are the general public, and I feel that I am representing today the general public, rather than one of these specific organizations or even somebody who is a landowner and has a very vested interest.

Melanie Plaut: I am talking today about public lands and how for me and my family, we think of ourselves as Americans partly because of our public lands. It's really central to our identity that we have these beautiful public lands that we can be part of. And certainly in the Pacific Northwest, for those of us who live both in rural and urban areas, it gives us a sense of place. A place to review and refresh ourselves and anything that strikes at the heart of these public lands diminishes our resilience and diminishes our commitment to place.

Melanie Plaut: So I would just ask you really to be sure that you are taking a broad view and not getting stuck in the labyrinth of the regulations. But stepping back a little and looking at the big picture. So one of the things I did when I was trying to figure out what to say on this call was I went to the BLM website and the title

when I googled, Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline Objections, the title of the webpage is Energy Independence. And I want to reflect back to what one of the previous objectors said, which is that this project has nothing to do with energy independence. This gas is not being used here locally. It is all being shipped overseas and it is not owned by a United States company, it's owned by Canada. So we have really in the risk benefit analysis, when you look at who is going to benefit from this project versus who will be at detriment, it's pretty clear that there is only risk to those of us who are here in Oregon who care about our public lands.

Melanie Plaut: There is the risk that we've talked about the fire impact. There is the risk to our streams and fish, to our slopes, to our habitat, fragmentation of our forest and the cumulative effect of all of these things diminish the quality of the public lands that I think belong to all of us. My understanding is that there is a rule that anything that's done in these late succession reserves has to be either neutral or beneficial. It's very difficult for me as a lay person to understand how putting the pipeline through here with its permanent clear cut is in any way beneficial. And it's pretty clear also that even with the matrix land allocations that you cannot completely mitigate what's going to happen in these areas that have old growth forest in them that can't be easily or quickly replaced.

Melanie Plaut: So I don't think that the environmental consequences of this can be eliminated. And I would just ask that, as I said in my testimony, my written testimony that you deny this project and ask the company to withdraw the project and that you do not concur with whatever the BLM and FERC wants to do. I'm not sure that I have any additional questions, but I'm open to questions from you. Thanks.

Debbie Anderson: Thank you, Melanie. Alice, do you have any clarifying questions?

Alice: No, I think I understood Melanie. I appreciate your point of view in terms of who the risks lay on in terms of the locale and a sense of place and the importance of that. That's important to us as a forest service as well. Really this concept of sense of place and I just... Let's see. I'm sorry, I just lost track of what I was going to say. So I get that. I just guess I want to tell you that, I understand your point of view about... Oh, I know what else it was, you asking me to, in my area of discretion that I have, to stand up broader and stronger rather than choose to go narrower. I will say that I do that and I really place importance on the factors that you brought up in terms of standing up for others, seeing us as interdependent on one another and the importance of the public lands, particularly those here, the residents in Southern Oregon. So thank you for that. And.

Melanie Plaut: Yeah, let me just say one other thing, which has to do with process. Even though I'm not a technical expert in this area, I'm pretty comfortable with complicated regulations and such. And yet I think this is extremely difficult for people without advanced degrees to have any say in what is going on as a forest servicer and the other federal regulatory bodies. I've heard references to how complicated the FERC system is and I am an intervener with FERC. There were

quite a few people I know who, who filed objections and they received something in the mail telling them that they weren't eligible and then like myself, they later received an email saying they were, there was a lot of confusion about this. So I think that there have been some things that made it even more difficult than it should have been for the public to engage in this process.

Debbie Anderson: And this is Debbie Anderson and I'll apologize for those confusions. We did try to keep the eligibility issues straight as possible. There was a bit of a mail merge issue with our database and so I've tried to personally apologize to all those people that that confusion happened with. I am not perfect. I'd never pretend to be, the day I don't ever make a mistake again it's probably the day I die. I own [crosstalk 00:04:51:38] my mistakes and I tried to apologize for, [crosstalk 04:51:46] I do feel bad.

Melanie Plaut: Yeah, mostly for the future to try to rectify that.

Debbie Anderson: And I promise I will always try to do better. Our systems are not perfect and I'm a staff of one right now so I will continue to apologize for any mistakes I make and yeah.

Melanie Plaut: Okay.

Debbie Anderson: So all I can do and trust me, I understand the complicated-ness of this project.

Melanie Plaut: Yeah.

Debbie Anderson: So yeah.

Melanie Plaut: Yeah.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. With that, do you have anything else Melanie?

Melanie Plaut: No, I think that's it. Thanks very much.

Debbie Anderson: Okay, thank you. So we are right on time. Denise did email me, she said she does not need to speak again since she spoke this morning but she wanted to reiterate that she agrees with and wants to reinforce the points made both by Francis and Deb Evans that fire is a big concern where she lives and that she is pointing out that BLM has a posting of a poster called Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline Strengthening America's Energy Independence that was just mentioned and that she feels if that poster is rather threatening and is overlooked, like it's a done deal regardless of consequences. So thank you Denise for that comment. That is a BLM poster that we have no authority over, but I registered that as part of the meeting. It will go in the transcripts and the audio recording as well. So with that operator, we're going to move on to Eileen Fromer. So if you could open Eileen.

Eileen Fromer: Hello. Hi, this is Eileen and I'm speaking as a member... Do you hear me? First of all...

Debbie Anderson: Yes Eileen, you're very clear.

Eileen Fromer: Okay great. Like Melanie, I'm speaking as a member of the public. I'm a forest hiker, a river rafter. I spend time in the Coos Bay area and Myrtle Point area with relatives. And I want to address just two general major concern to me. And that is the effects of clear-cutting and methane emissions. So clear cutting is a major driver of climate change. If we allow this pipeline to be built, it will be the largest forest clear-cut in Oregon history, the sides of the interstate highway and a permanent 50-foot-wide right of way.

Eileen Fromer: In addition to removing extreme size trees and others vegetation that shade streams and keep them cool. Removing these trees violates Oregon's water quality standards for temperature. It also violates Oregon classic standard by disturbing and [inaudible 04:54:39] contaminated materials in these waters. The pipeline will cross streams, the forest, including Little Butte, Spencer and Trail Creeks and at each place where the pipeline crosses streams the construction will degrade fish habitat and water quality. Particularly, as the water heads downstream and endangers the health of fish, insects and other organisms in the water and its environment. I can't help but think of the salmon who come to these forests and waters to spawn. And specifically the pipeline will violate water quality standards including bio criteria, temperature and turbidity.

Eileen Fromer: Watershed dominated by clear cuts are far more susceptible to low water flows, toxic algae blooms, wildfire, floods and landslides. By clearing a permanent corridor of the forest, the pipeline increases the risk of fast moving wildfires. And to suppress fire, they often use heavy equipment to dig and turnover soils to adequately distribute the heat and suppress the fire. These normal suppression efforts will be impeded with the placement of the pipeline.

Eileen Fromer: The risk of fire in these proposed pipeline locations is very real in forested areas and serious concerns both economically and more importantly from a safety perspective. A summertime explosion during fire season could be catastrophic costing the state and local communities millions in firefighting costs. All this not to mention the atmosphere warming from less sequestration of carbon by our trees. And then there's the methane. The pipeline full of high pressure gas is highly explosive and passes through forests with a high risk of wildfires. Pipeline construction would also occur in steep and remote terrain prone, not just to wildfire, but also landslides causing erosion into our waterways. Any methane that escapes during transport through the pipeline on the way to the power plant warms the planet very effectively, so effectively, that if you leak more than two or three percent it's worse for climate change than coal. Most studies show that leakage rates are at least three percent and.

PART 9 OF 11 ENDS [04:57:04]

Eileen: The study showed that leakage rates are at least 3% and probably higher. According to the U.S. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, during the last 30 years, there's been 9,000 reported significant pipeline incidents nationwide with thousands of smaller incidents. This has resulted in nearly 550 deaths, 2,600 injuries, and 8.5 billion dollars in financial damages. During the past 10 years, pipeline accidents are accelerating as the U.S. increases its fossil fuel production, despite the catastrophic impact of such actions on greenhouse gas emissions and global climate changes. Further, there is no guarantee that Pembina would cover the cost of restoration [crosstalk 04:57:50] if the pipeline ever fails. For these reasons, I believe we have to consider alternatives that meet the Forest Service land-use plan as written and deny Pembina access to our forest just so they can construct a frack gas pipeline that endangers lives, adds to atmospheric warming and further enables the extraction economy.

Debbie: Okay. Thank you very much. Alice, do you have any clarifying questions?

Alice: No. I think, Eileen, you were really clear about the effects of a couple of things. One is the creation of the right-of-way itself and the long-term status of vegetation on that right-of-way and what that does both during its creation and through time, including difficulties with water quality problems, fisheries, aquatic and so on. And then also understanding your concern about the potential for increased problems with wildfire and what that might do to inhibit our suppression, impede our suppression efforts. And then just economic and safety concerns with the carbon emission and the landslides that had been mentioned earlier before, I think you mentioned that as well. So, and that your resolution is to just say no and deny the project. Did I capture that well? Do I understand?

Eileen: You did a great job. Thank you.

Alice: Okay, good. Thank you. Appreciate it.

Debbie: Okay, do you have anything else, Eileen?

Eileen: No, I don't. Thank you.

Debbie: Okay. Thank you very much for joining us and for again, being so patient in trying to get everyone set up on these lines. So operator, if you'll mute all of the rest of the lines again, and next we'll go to Rihanna Koppel. I know we're a little bit early, so Rihanna, if you're on... If you're not, we'll hold for you or go to the next person and then return. So Rihanna... If you could unmute Rihanna's line if she's still on.

Debbie: Yes, we can hear you fine. (silence)

Debbie: I'll go to Alice for questions.

Alice: No, I'm clear. Thank you [inaudible 05:05:06]

Debbie: Okay. Rihanna, again, thank you for your time and for being so patient with us as we got the information to you. Again, I appreciate everyone's efforts in trying to get registered for this. This is a new process for us. I know it wasn't satisfactory to everyone, but given the potential expected objections... objectors attending, this was our only real solution. So operator, if you'll mute the other phones and go next... If hopefully she's on the phone early, we'll go to Katherine Bragg, B-R-A-G-G.

Operator: And I currently do not see Katherine on the line.

Debbie: You do not currently see Katherine on the line?

Operator: Right.

Debbie: Okay. We'll move to our next objector. If not, we may... If the other two objectors aren't on the line, we may take a short break and then come back to them. So is... Do you see a Deb McGee, M-C-G-E-E active? Okay. If you'll activate Deb's line, we'll come back to Catherine. I'll send her an email while we wait.

Operator: Perfect.

Deb McGee: Hi, my name is Deborah McGee. Am I on?

Debbie Anderson: You are on and loud and clear. Thank you.

Deb McGee: Okay, excellent. I'm Deborah McGee. I've lived in Oregon for 40 years. While I was born in the Midwest Plains, I moved here because I love the mountains and the forest, the wilderness and the Pacific Northwest. Even as I age, and I'm getting close to 70, I continue to take long backpack trips into the forest. I'm not a scientist or a wildlife person. I am a K-12 public school educator and community mental health professional. I retired and I woke up to the climate crisis, and so as a responsible person, I've dedicated the last chapter of my life to confronting the coming climate collapse and trying to stop the worst of the harms. On a personal level, the very last thing I want to think about and worry about while hiking in the beauty of nature is a 36-inch pressurized pipeline filled with explosive liquid fossil fuels that could catch the woods on fire.

Deb McGee: All pipelines leak sooner or later, and pipeline accidents happen regularly. On a community level, I have great respect for the governmental agencies that hold our public lands and trust for future generations of Americans. My father was a park ranger. I spent summers growing up in Wind Cave National Park in South Dakota. I know how hard you work and how important your work is. The Forest Service is responsible for protecting our shared trust forest, and I do object that my tax dollar funded Forest Service would be charged with considering changing the rules that protect the forest for my grandchildren and the children of all

living things. That this change would be considered in order to increase private corporate profits that put profits over the health and safety of the people and the habitat is just totally not an appropriate use of the public trust that we hold in our national forests.

Deb McGee: And while I realize that this is not at all your purview in the process, I think you should be concerned and you should realize that our nation's children are beginning to show the signs of the emotional traumatic stress of the impending climate collapse. And I believe that the well-being of future generations should be considered in anything that we're doing that increases the harm to the environment. I believe that Jordan Cove Pacific Connector is a horrible idea for many reasons, including that it would further increase fracking and fossil fuel extraction for our neighbors in other states exactly at the same time when scientific research is telling us that we have to lower our greenhouse gas emissions that are fueling the climate collapse. So I do hope that your resolution to my objection will be to deny the Pacific Connector Pipeline the use of our public lands for their private gain.

Deb McGee: And at the very minimum, please take a no-action alternative or consider an alternative that meets all of the existing land use management plans. I believe this project is a disaster, and it's not appropriate to be happening in our public forests. Unfortunately, we are a species that is denying our own, destroying our own habitat that is necessary for our own survival. And so I hope that you folks will deny the project and the changes and continue your solid good work of protecting our public forests. And that is all I have to say. Thank you for listening.

Alice Carlton: So Deb, this is Alice. I want to thank you for talking about the state of our children in the United States and how things in decisions that we make on the public lands do matter to our citizens and especially our children. I want to congratulate you on staying... You're keeping yourself in physical enough of good shape... nearly 70 to be continuing to backpack through these treasured lands that we have. That's, for many people, quite a feat. And I want to really honor you for that. And I take seriously your resolution that you believe that we need to either choose the no-action alternative or at least find an alternative, an actual alternative that doesn't need amendments of the current forest plan standards and guidelines that we have.

Deb McGee: Well, thank you, Alice. Keep fighting for us. We need it.

Alice Carlton: We need your support, too. Thank you.

Deb McGee: You've got it. [crosstalk 05:11:14] Okay, thanks.

Debbie Anderson: Thank you, Deb. And again, Deb, I apologize for the miscommunications with email and instructions, and I'm happy you were able to register and dial in.

Deb McGee: You were very helpful. Thank you, Debbie. Appreciate it.

Debbie Anderson: Okay, so operator, Katherine Bragg says she can hear us, but it says that she could not... her line was not unmuted. So I just sent you her email again to try to find her. If you could try to unmute Katherine Bragg's line, Bragg line next.

Katherine Bragg: Can you hear me?

Debbie: Yes, we can hear you. Is that you, Katherine?

Katherine Bragg: Wonderful. This is Katherine Bragg.

Debbie: Thank you. You can go ahead and speak now.

Katherine Bragg: Thank you for including me in the comments about the Forest Service, and since I really value our national forest and their role in preserving our environment and our habitat, I think that it's incredibly important that we don't make any exceptions and allow a pipeline to pass through our forests in southern Oregon. The reason we protect the land is because it has so many virtues for the present and future generations, and we can't make exceptions left and right in the little fraction of forests that are actually protected. The Connector Pipeline would be a dangerous, leaking passageway of natural gas through our valuable land. And once you dig up a ditch and put a 36-inch pipeline through it and then run natural gas underneath the forest and the creeks, you've completely altered the environment and that will not be the same again in thousands of years.

Katherine Bragg: So now is the time to prevent such silly, short-sighted ideas that moreover only benefits the fossil fuel company that is fracking the gas and the fossil fuel burners in Asia that would further contaminate the climate using that gas. So it really is a negative-sum game, and I would like to really implore the Forest Service to continue its role of preserving those forests where I, like others, hike and raft and camp and be the pristine lands or nearly pristine lands that have great value and can't be replaced. So we need to do everything right now in the shortest amount of time possible to preserve and enhance their protection, not take those protections away and provide for destructive forces to use them. Those are my comments.

Alice: Thank you. This is Alice, Katherine. Thank you for taking the time, particularly to hang on the line and work through the process of getting your comments in front of us. And so I really appreciate your tenacity and your heartfelt feelings and your thoughts about the long-term nature of digging a trench through the national forest and what that alters permanently and that you really prefer the nearly pristine conditions of a forest and that those really can't be replaced. So I appreciate that very much.

Katherine Bragg: Thank you. [crosstalk 05:15:12]

Alice: You're welcome.

Debbie: Okay. And I confirmed our last speaker is available. So operator, if you'll mute all lines. And the next speaker will be Toma Deavers. As I indicated in my opening remarks, we had a few additions and so Toma, if you can hear me, your line should be open and you have your 15 minutes.

Toma Deavers: Hi there. I'm hoping that since we're a little bit ahead of time, I might get a little bit more than 15 minutes, but I would like... Can you hear me okay?

Debbie: Yes. And to be fair, it will be limited to 15 minutes.

Toma Deavers: Okay. So my big problem here is that Oregonians feel like we're being ignored on many levels. The state permits were denied, so I'm wondering why we're even having this conversation. And I'm wondering who's footing the bill for this time that we have on the phone. Costs like this from the national Forest Service and the Department of Interior, the cost of the analysis of the EIS that should have been included in the economic impact of the EIS. That's not even addressed anywhere. And what I'm hearing and what a lot of us folks, Oregonians are saying is that we're really uneasy with this conversation because you act like you're going to listen to us. But it sounds like the overarching agreement is that the ultimate decision here about this special land-use permit on national Forest Service land is going to be determined by the Department of Interior, Secretary of Interior, David Bernhardt.

Toma Deavers: And I would like to point out that our Senator Wyden and our Representative Peter DeFazio have already stated the problems to David Bernhardt. He has two ethics violations right now that are being ignored. Also, Wyden pointed out that Jorjani at the Department of Interior, he's possibly perjured himself and there's also ethics violations there. Wyden is being ignored. DeFazio is being ignored. [inaudible 05:17:35] is being ignored. Citizens are being ignored. So who's in charge here? And you know what? I want some answers because you know, we just read this Intercept article about the surveillance happening on anti-pipeline activists such as myself, and BLM was included in that. So how can we trust the BLM to make reasonable decisions when they are actually responsible for this illegal surveillance on us [inaudible 05:18:03] anti-pipeline activists. This is like a public trust issue.

Toma Deavers: I'm just enraged that our safety issues, that our senators have been ignored. Also just yesterday, Wyden stated his opposition to the new FERC commissioner, James Danly, who is being appointed to the commission, like that process is moving forward. And Wyden, again, he's being ignored because he pointed out that the FERC needs to have two Republicans on board and two Democrats on board as commissioners so it's a balanced commission. There's not even a full quorum at FERC right now. And currently the Trump administration is trying to add another Republican commissioner, which further tips the balance towards the Trump agenda and the Republican agenda. So how can you tell us that you're listening to us and not wasting yours and our time

when we see that again and again and again, we are being ignored. So I would like to really know, "Hey, the Department of Interior, is anyone addressing the ethics violations of David Bernhardt or Daniel Jorjani?"

Toma Deavers: I would also like to understand... BLM was mentioned in the Intercept article as being onboard with the surveillance. How can we, as the public, trust that the Department of Interior is taking our concerns seriously when it has already violated our rights, our Fourth Amendment rights as American citizens to have a right to privacy. The fact that a Canadian company was working with the BLM to violate our rights is completely unacceptable. And furthermore, you know what? I talked to Sean Mole at the Oregon Department of Energy. He still has not got a concrete answer from Pembina, a legally-binding statement stating exactly how much energy they will produce on site. For background information, this also has to do with the energy that will be required at the terminal on site. This relates directly to the danger of the terminal, meaning the danger of the blast zone because until we know how much energy is going to be produced and used on site, we don't know how big the blast zone is going to be.

Toma Deavers: Sean will ask Pembina for this legally-binding agreement determining the most dangerous parts of the project, which is the terminal in a liquefaction zone. We still do not have this information, and Pembina has violated our rights of privacy. How can we expect us to trust the Department of Interior and FERC to take the public safety issues seriously? I think that the big problem here is that the national Forest Service needs to step up to the plate and do its job and not let the Department of Interior strong-arm you into overstepping its authority and letting David Bernhardt, who is, really has a conflict of interest because he is a former employee of Pembina. He works for the lobbying firm, Bernstein Harbor Hyatt, let me see. It is Bernstein Harbor and Schreck, I believe is the name of the lobbying firm that David Bernhardt used to work for. Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck is the lobbying firm that David Bernhardt used to work for. That is a lobbying firm of Pembina.

Toma Deavers: So how can we expect that our voices are being heard when these things are being ignored? There's a conflict of interest there. So you know, I want to know actually who... the EIS, the project needs to be canceled completely. These special land-use amendments need to be canceled immediately and denied. We have no trust in the Department of Interior. And the national Forest Service needs to step up to the plate and protect and abide by existing land-use requirements and not make special accommodation for a Canadian company that has already violated our rights of privacy. This is just outrageous, and as Oregonians, we won't stand for it. We are already prepared that if FERC issues a permit for this project after our state has denied DEQ permits, DSL permits and CDCL permits, we as Oregonians will stand up and we will not allow this project to be built. We are prepared to state that we do not recognize the authority of FERC due to the fact that we are being ignored and there are serious ethics violations stemming from the Department of Interior and David Bernhardt.

Toma Deavers: So you know what? We need proof. We need a full investigation into who was in charge of the illegal surveillance and is there evidence that there is any terrorism dangers? We need evidence because you know what? I feel like my rights have been violated. Am I a terrorist for being concerned about the real safety impacts of the project? Like, misleading information about the blast zone of the terminal that sits in a liquefaction zone on our beloved estuary in Coos Bay. What about the LNG carrier? There was no information provided about the impact and the safety risk of an LNG carrier explosion. Why weren't we given information on that? That was just ignored. I mean the list just goes on. Okay. And I have another thing that should stop the whole project. I have another thing that should stop the whole project. There was no assessment for tornado risk.

Toma Deavers: There was just a tornado over in Manzanita in January that's not far from the terminal location. So there needs to be a complete assessment of the tornado risk of this terminal as well. So I mean, I just have to start out by saying it's just really upsetting that we're having this conversation and we're expected to believe that our voices are being heard when they're not being heard at all. You know what? [crosstalk 05:26:02].

Debbie: This is Debbie. [crosstalk 05:26:05] I'm going to step in. You have about five minutes left. We hear and are recording and transcribing your concerns. The focus of this meeting was on the national forest system's authority, and while we understand your concerns at the terminal and in the shipping harbors and et cetera, if we could refocus the discussion to the national forest system's decision authority for the next five minutes, that would be greatly appreciated.

Toma Deavers: Well, I mean the whole conversation started with y'all saying that David Bernhardt at the department, the Secretary of Interior has the final say on these things, you know, and [crosstalk 05:26:47]

Debbie: So let me, let me just interrupt you because that is not what was said. What was said was that at this point, the Forest Service has consent to give to, can give consent to the BLM if for some reason, which is speculative and we don't want to get into the speculations, if for some reason there was an agreement between the Forest Service and the BLM at the state director level and at Alice Carlton's level, then it could elevate to the secretaries. There was never any assertion that the final decision would rest with the BLM. It was a conversation that was asked as a what if, so if you heard differently, I apologize for that, but that is not what was intended to be said. And so if we can refocus the conversation on the Forest Service authority, that would be great.

Toma Deavers: Okay. But I did hear that the department, the Secretary of Interior probably would have the final say on this. Is that incorrect?

Debbie: So right now, the decision authority still lies at the State of Oregon BLM office level.

Toma Deavers: Okay. So I mean obviously [crosstalk 05:27:51] Okay. So I will go on to speak specifically about the land, the special land use, site-specific land-use amendments that y'all tried to write for a Canadian gas company. Okay. That's already [crosstalk 05:28:04] violated our rights.

Debbie: [inaudible 05:28:05] to finish that. [crosstalk 05:28:06] And you have three minutes to finish that at which time I will ask the operator to cut you off.

Toma Deavers: You told me that you're giving me five minutes, and I would like my five minutes.

Debbie: From the time that, yes, and you will get that [crosstalk 05:28:19] and you will get your 15 minutes total.

Toma Deavers: Okay, so [crosstalk 05:28:24] Okay. I totally oppose the site-specific land-use amendment proposed by the BLM and national Forest Service lands that would violate the riparian restricted zones and the late successional reserved restricted zones, as well. The late successional reserve needs to be protected. As you know, our endangered species, the spotted owl and the marbled murrelet, are dependent on these late successional reserves.

Toma Deavers: So I would urge you at the national Forest Service and BLM to deny this site-specific land-use amendment for the Jordan Cove Energy Project. Also, the restricted riparian zones on national forest lands. These land-use laws need to be respected. We have a problem. It's called global warming. And wildfires in our state and the coho salmon, an endangered species or a threatened species, is having a very difficult year already. My mom, I just talked to her in southern Oregon. It's really hot and dry in southern Oregon. They didn't get the rain that northern Oregon... We are looking at a very severe wildfire season. Wyden just gave \$65 million to the national Forest Service to help prevent wildfires. So there's a conflict of interest here because if you're trying to prevent wildfires...

PART 10 OF 11 ENDS [05:30:04]

Toma: There's a conflict of interest here cause if you're trying to prevent wildfire while also allowing a wildfire hazard to be built. I think your values needs to be clarified at the National Forest Service. But yes, you should not be going using... You need to... Those restricted riparian zones, those need to be respected, our coho salmon are struggling and if you tear through the riparian zones, it's going to heat the water and it's going to fry the fish. And also the Late Successional Reserves, those need to be left alone. Our endangered species, the spotted owl, marbled murrelet. They need to be protected. And we do have an issue with called wildfire. I used to be a firefighter in Southern Oregon. It's real, every year my family fears being evacuated again, living in smoke, my nieces and nephews.

Toma: So you know why, why wasn't the firefight... wildfire impact listed in the economic impact of the EIS? This has not been addressed. You know what,

Southern Oregon has lost a lot of money because of wildfire. Our farmers, our recreational... tourism industry lost a lot of money. Why isn't that included in the EIS? This is a failed EIS process. We don't trust it. There's gaping holes and the EIS and the whole project needs the permit... need to be denied. I don't even understand why we are wasting our time on this conversation because our state has already denied the permit and we will stand up for our rights and we will stand up for the safety of our land and water and we are prepared to state that FERC is not an authority on the matter. We see the flaws, we see the conflict of interest, we see all the corruption and the State of Oregon will not put up with it.

Toma: We will protect our water. We will protect our land and I strongly urge the National Forest Service and BLM to deny the site specific land use amendments on National Forest service land. The restricted riparian zones need to be left alone. The Late Successional Reserves needs to be left alone, Pembina needs to stay out of our state. They have serious violations and ethics concerns to answer for. We still need to know... BLM was in charge and a part of the surveillance. We need to find evidence that any of us were engaged in terrorist activities because BLM has some answering to do here. We cannot trust the BLM and they certainly should not be granting special sites, specific land use amendment for a Canadian gas company that no one in our state wants. When will we be listened to?

Toma: When will our tax dollar money be paid for something more important like preparing our state for wildfire season instead of spending all this time assessing a horrible project for a Canadian company in our state. The DSL has serious questions to answer because we just learned that over the 15 years their time and effort came out of the common school fund. Pembina. Oh, it's the State of Oregon for 15 years of analyzing this horrible project. Even Sean Mole, the Department of Energy agreed with me. We shouldn't be doing... The State of Oregon should not be doing one lick of work more for Pembina until they have paid up. Vicki Walker pointed that out in the February 4th meeting, this is what she said. "I would mention governor Land Board members that we still have your very huge Removal-Fill project that's simply paid the filing fee yet, it's consumed 15 years of staff time and it only paid the filing fee. So we really need to look at recovering our costs."

Toma: That's the words that Vicki Walker and our governor Kate Brown responded by saying "Oregons would be outraged if they understood." I would like to tell you that we do understand and we are outraged and Pembina owes the Department of State Land those costs for analyzing this complex and complicated, ridiculous plan for 15 years and till that.

Toma: You know what? Nothing should be on the table. And furthermore, there needs to be a full economic impact statement... Assessed, not a phony one, like the existing one... That includes all of these costs, including this phone call, including this phone call, including all of the work on the federal and state levels. We need the tax payer expense of all of this time spent on a Canadian gas company

pipeline that no one in our state wants. That has not been provided in the EIA and it needs to be provided including all of the federal and state costs of this surveillance that was used on anti-pipeline activists. That also needs to be included in the economic impact statement of the EIS, which has not been addressed. We are tired of being lied to. We were tired of being ignored. You should listen to our state senators, Senator Wyden, Senator Merkley, Representative Piluso, and cancel the project, ban it. Pembina should be sued right now so that the illegal surveillance... I want answers. This is outrageous.

Debbie Anderson: [crosstalk 05:36:17] [Toma 00:05:36:18]. I'd given you an additional six minutes. So operator, I gave you more than your five minutes. So operator, if you'll mute the lines please.

Alice Carlson: So tell me, this is Alice Carlson. I want to register that you've been very clear about the need to deny that public trust is a big issue that you and others will stand up for this that you feel... I would say passionately isn't... is a... is an understatement for how you feel about this and what you think about it and specifically for the Forest Service that you urge us to not consider site specific amendments that would violate the LSR and riparian allocations that... with respect to the species and the water quality, it's far too important to us as citizens here in Oregon to lessen those allocational standards and that wildfire is real, the economic and social impacts, the smoke and health concerns and so on, particularly in Southern Oregon has been very acute and real the last few years.

Alice Carlson: And you want to just make sure that we adequately address the impacts from the potential impacts from a pipeline on those wildfire as well. I know that you can't respond at this point, but I appreciate your time, your passion and your energy.

Debbie Anderson: Okay, so I'll just recap and go over our last steps and or next steps I should say. So as I stated at the beginning and that you saw in the agenda that the meeting is being recorded and it is being transcribed, we will receive those recordings and transcriptions in the next several days. I will post those on the Umpqua National Forest project page for this project. So if you go to the Umpqua National Forest webpage and go to planning and projects, go to land and resource management planning and projects, I will make sure that both the MP3 file and the written transcripts are posted.

Debbie Anderson: As I stated at the beginning of this, the response to the objections that were raised under the 36 CFR 218 project level objections, Gina will be signing the letters to the objectors no later than March 23rd so that is for the 218 objections that were raised for the 219 objections that were raised in that we addressed this morning. Those should go out no later than April 21st which is the 90 day review period. That said the 90 day review period can be extended. The 75 days for the 218 objection review period cannot. As I stated earlier, it's our intention to bundle those together and to have both objection review periods finalized on the 23rd there's an administrative process once the letters

are signed to get them mailed to you. I know a few folks would like hard copy letters if you can email me if you prefer a hard copy letter.

Debbie Anderson: Otherwise, we will email you those letters, which will save postage, taxpayer dollars and an inordinate amount of time that it takes to photocopy, scan, mail, et cetera, so if you do request... And George, I already got yours. If you do request a hard copy letter, please let me know if you would prefer that. Otherwise, we will email them to you. They will also be posted on the national objection's webpage under Region Six. So as you can see your objection in the reading room of the project, there's a link when you go to the project's webpage to the objection responses. Once those are done, those will also be posted to the national objections webpage under Region Six tabs for that. So you will be able to see the objections. Our intent is to bundle them, so you'll receive a letter, a cover letter as well as a written response to the objections.

Debbie Anderson: We didn't intend to do a point by point response. Instead, we've tried to group your objections into themes and like objection issues and that's how we intend to respond at this point. As we stated earlier, there could be a number of outcomes from the objection review. Alice can be given instructions to clarify items and as you've heard on this call today, whether you are here this morning or the after this afternoon, we already have identified some items that do need to be clarified and we've tried to be upfront about those and that we know that they need clarity and we intend for Alice to receive that instruction to clarify those with the objections process, there are no surprises as we've tried to also say. So Alice has been well aware of the review team's findings to date and so we have identified some of those clarities that need to be made in the future.

Debbie Anderson: The outcome can be that the decision proceed as planned, that there'd be clarification's. There could be additional instructions for potential analysis that might happen. We're not sure yet because we're not done. Those of you that have participated in the objections process before, understand this, those of you that are new to it, that is the realm of things that can occur. What Alice does with those instructions is up to her. I think that Alice did an excellent job today laying out her decision space and what her considerations are. Ultimately Alice is the deciding official. She is the responsible official. Gina is the reviewing official. She will make recommendations to Alice but ultimately it is Alice's final decision... So with that the timelines I have given and raised or have outlined and raised we intend to adhere to.

Debbie Anderson: I also have committed to posting the transcription and the MP3 file that have the audio of this. At this point the official meeting is done if you have any process questions as far as what comes next, if you could hit * two on your phone and that raises your hand to the operator, if you could do that at this time. At this point, if a process question only, it is not a reiteration of your concern, I will have the operator mute you if you try to re-iterate your concern. So all I need right now are process questions of where we are moving forward. So operator has anyone pressed * two

Operator: There are currently no hands in the queue.

Debbie Anderson: All right. I will give another one second or two to get to those if anyone has them.

Debbie Anderson: They're starting, I guess it's # two... Is it start * two or # two? Hold on. I may have... Operator, is it... Oh # two okay. So I apologize I missed folks. So if you have a question, please hit # two. I will wait for that.

Operator: And we do have a question. [inaudible 05:44:02]

Debbie Anderson: Please identify yourself first.

Toma: So yeah, just tell me [Deaver 00:14:08]... I'm just wondering how the process moves forward because the public convenience and necessity has not been addressed. It's just ridiculous to think that this gas pipeline is for Oregonians public necessity and convenience and the safety issues need to be addressed. The corruption at the Department of Interior needs to be addressed. So how can we be-

Speaker 8: [crosstalk 05:44:41].

Debbie Anderson: We heard that and I'll be happy to answer your question as I understand it is what comes next and why are we even moving forward? So the objections process is part of what comes after a final EIS and a draft record of decision has been issued. A final decision has not been made and will not move forward until any instructions from the reviewing officer have been completed. The Forest Service is well aware that FERC has not issued a certificate. The Forest Service is well aware that the state has not issued any permits and the Forest Service is well aware that the BLM is still in process. So at this point we are finishing the objections process only and that is where we are in this. There are a number of steps that need to be completed by a number of other agencies and the Forest Service is well aware of those.

Debbie Anderson: Operator. I'm ready for the next question if there are any.

Operator: We do have one more question. Please go ahead.

Lynn Warner: Yes. What will be the timeline? Will we have another time?

Debbie Anderson: Please identify yourself.

Lynn Warner: Yeah, Lynn Warner. I just did a questioning. Pardon? I just trying to find out the timeline. Would we be writing more letters, what's the next stage and how will we be hearing about what's coming in the future?

Debbie Anderson: So the Forest Services, thank you for that question. The Forest Service's responsibility will be to respond to your objections in writing, which we will do by the time frames I've listed. At a time a decision is made in the future on the final record of decision, the Forest Service's responsibility is to notify interested and effected persons, typically through mail or email, depending on your capacity and to post that final decision to the project's webpage. As far as other agency's responsibilities and obligations are concerned, that is outside the Forest Services scope and scale of authority and so the BLM protest process or whatever other agency has an action in this. That is something the forest service, again we're aware of, but it is not within our jurisdiction to address.

Lynn Warner: I'm not [crosstalk 05:47:18].

Debbie Anderson: I'm ready for the next question. I'm sorry, Lynn, did you have a clarification?

Lynn Warner: Yeah, like is there a place we can email into or something where we can get a timeline? Something like that.

Debbie Anderson: So again, the only timeline I can give you today is March 23rd and April 21st I have no ability... My world is objections. That is what I do. I do administrative review and that is all that we are addressing on this call today. Anything that happens in the future with other agencies or the Forest Services final decision is far outside of my ability to address.

Debbie Anderson: And I'm sorry if that's not satisfactory, but that's all I can give you.

Operator: Thank you, and there are currently no additional questions in the queue.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. I will give it another minute if there's one additional questions since we are finishing a little early.

Operator: And we did just get another question.

Speaker 8: Okay. And it's a process question, so please identify yourself.

Francis Eatherington: Hi, this is [Francis 00:05:48:39]. So I appreciate what the Forest Services timeline is and I'm sure you're aware that March 20th is to next for convening where they could make a decision on March 20th where your timeline extends past that. And so will there be any influence in FERC decision on your responses?

Debbie Anderson: So let's see, March 20th is a Friday, so I'll... and actually I'm even off that day so I'm just going to move forward with my job, Francis, in preparing the objection response. If something happens that would cause Gina or Alice to take pause with that, they would inform me of that. I have a regulatory deadline to get to Gina and that is my job right now. And so if something influences that from Gina or Alice's perspective, they will inform me and I will make that adjustment. But I am not entertaining any sort of regulatory violation by not responding in time.

We work very hard in this office to ensure that we meet our regulatory timelines. And so if something happens that causes Gina or Alice to take pause, they will inform me of that. But at this point we are trying to issue our written responses as required by regulation.

Alice Carlson: Okay. Thank you.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. Yeah. Okay. Operator? Any other questions?

Operator: We do have one more question in the queue.

Debbie Anderson: Okay. Go ahead and please identify yourself.

Toma: Hello?

Debbie Anderson: Hello?

Toma: Oh yeah. So in regards to Francis's question, So you're saying that the FERC decision may not actually weigh the National Forest decision that it's possible that the FERC decision could come before the National Forest decision?

Debbie Anderson: So thank you for that question. I will reiterate that we have a regulatory obligation to respond to your objections. If something changes, Gina and Alice will inform me of that and if I need to adjust our responses I will take their direction. At this point we are basing the response to the objections on what we know and have heard to date and what has happened during the review. As I stated previously, we have a number of clarifications that we have already articulated that we know need to happen. We have not completed the final review. We are still in process. The objections process is a step. It is a legally required regulatory required step once the final EIS is authored and issued and a draft decision is made. After that I have no ability to speak to timelines, influences or other agency's decision.

Debbie Anderson: Operator, do we have any other questions?

Operator: There are no additional questions in the queue.

Debbie Anderson: All right, thank you operator. Again, I'm going to turn it over to Alice to just have any one last remark.

Alice Carlson: So many of you have been with us since nine this morning and that is an incredible amount of time to spend in on a phone call. Just want to say that and again to really thank each one of you. I think about these things that people like yourself are concerned about this and it's not about what you're getting paid for. It's not about the money, it's not about anything other than your deep concerns about how our public lands are managed and what you'd like to see in

what you think is better not to occur. So thank you for sticking with us during this process. That is not what any of us would consider ideal.

Debbie Anderson: Thank you Alice. And I know Gina echoes those remarks as those [Rita 00:05:52:59], again from my perspective and from on behalf of me, I do apologize for any confusion in letters that you received.

Debbie Anderson: We work very hard to try to be clear in our communications and to not have those issues happen. I am human and they did happen and for that I do apologize to those objectors who received confusing information. We will try to make sure that we've sorted that out completely in the final responses. As I stated earlier, we'll be posting the information on the website as well as you'll receive those written responses to your objections and again thank you all very much for hanging in there with us. While we tried something entirely new as far as our teleconference, as I stated previously, our phone lines cannot handle a large volume of callers and this was the process available to us to try to manage what was potentially what we thought could be several hundred callers so we didn't end up with those numbers but it's still, I appreciate everyone, everyone's willingness to work with me and to get your questions answered and to troubleshoot for you to try to make sure that you could attend this call.

Debbie Anderson: With that we will conclude today. I would like to thank everyone for their participation and if you have any particular questions, you all have my email and I'll do my best to respond to those. I will state that at this point you are not eligible to raise any additional issues that are not already raised in writing. So please know we have your written objections and we've heard from you today and we will be addressing your objection issues to the extent that they are within the Forest Services purview. Thank you everyone and please have a wonderful day. Bye. Operator. Thank you.

Operator: That concludes our conference. Thank you for using Events Services. You may now disconnect.

PART 11 OF 11 ENDS [05:54:53]